DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 027 HE 005 587

TITLE University Autonomy: Its Meaning Today. Papers-7.
INSTITUTION International Association of Universities, Paris (France).
PUB DATE 65
NOTE 141p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$6.60 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Academic Freedom; *College Environment; Decision Making; *Governance; *Higher Education; *Individual Power; Self Control; *University Administration

ABSTRACT

University autonomy is discussed in detail in the first paper, which suggests that there is full recognition of the principle that the duty of the universities is to serve the public interest, rightly conceived; that their claim to a high degree of autonomy rests not on privilege, but on the teaching of experience; that only under that condition can they give the full measure of their service; and that they have no title to be exempt from public interest, judgment and criticism--on the contrary, that they use their freedom best when, under the stimulus of such judgment, they hold their policies under frequent review. Fifteen other papers from representatives of various nations suggest five elements of university autonomy are essential--not as special privileges, but as the basic conditions that enable the universities to perform effectively. They include: (1) The university should have the right to select its own staff. (2) The university should be responsible for the selection of its students. (3) Universities should be responsible for the formulation of curricula for each degree and for the setting of academic standards. (4) Each university should have the final decisions as to the research program carried on within its walls. (5) The university should be responsible within wide limits, for the allocation among its various activities of the financial resources available. (MJM)

ED 092027

International Association of Universities

PAPERS - 7

UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY

ITS MEANING TODAY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
International Assoc of Universities
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

HE 005 507

PARIS 1965

UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY

ITS MEANING TODAY

ED 092027

PAPERS
OF THE
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

N° 7

UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY

ITS MEANING TODAY

6, rue Franklin, Paris XVIe
1965

The French edition of this volume is published under the title:

L'Autonomie universitaire — sa signification aujourd'hui.

Second Impression, 1965

© Copyright by the International Association of Universities, 1965.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION — Dr. F.Cyril James

UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY — Sir Hector Hetherington..... 1

COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

Dr. J. Baugniet (Belgium) 39

Dr. A. Blinkenberg (Denmark) 45

Dr. M. Bouchard (France) 57

Dr. H. Butterfield (United Kingdom) 69

Dr. N. Carrillo (Mexico) 71

Dr. R. Frondizi (Argentina) 73

S.N. El Hag Ali (Sudan) 79

Dr. A.C. Joshi (India) 85

Dr. E. Lehnartz (Federal Republic of Germany) 93

Dr. B. Mazar (Israel) 99

Dr. T. Morito (Japan) 103

Dr. F. Vito (Italy) 117

Dr. G.D. Vovtchenko (U.S.S.R.) 121

Dr. H.B Wells (U.S.A.) 125

Dr. C.K. Zurayk (Lebanon) 129

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE — Sir Hector Hetherington 137

UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY
ITS MEANING TODAY

INTRODUCTION

by F. Cyril James

President, International Association of Universities
Principal Emeritus, McGill University, Montreal

The statements on university autonomy that follow are to be regarded not as authoritative dicta but as a preliminary dialogue which, it is hoped, will continue during the sessions of the Association's Fourth General Conference at Tokyo.

The concept of university autonomy is as old as universities themselves, and the earlier struggles to attain it constitute an exciting chapter in the history of such institutions as Bologna, Paris and Oxford. But concepts that have become hallowed by tradition must be examined anew in each generation, especially in periods like that in which we are now living when the structure of society in every part of the world is changing dynamically and universities (more numerous than ever before) are expected to contribute substantially to that process of social change. Is university autonomy important in the twentieth century? For what reasons? Is university autonomy endangered by the forces that are so rapidly changing the pattern of our society?

Three years ago, at its meetings held in Delhi in 1962, the Administrative Board decided to ask Sir Hector Hetherington, one of the most experienced of the Vice-Chancellors of the United Kingdom, to prepare for its consideration a memorandum on University Autonomy.* This document, substantially in the form in which it appears in the following pages, was discussed at length with Sir Hector Hetherington by the members of the Administrative Board at the meetings held in Cambridge, in 1963, and it was agreed that each member of the Board should write a memorandum relating those discussions to the situation that exists today in his own part of the world. These memoranda, which are also reproduced in the following pages, were discussed at the 1964 meetings of the Board, in Moscow, when it was decided to bring the whole matter before the Tokyo Conference for further consideration.

---

* The revision of this memorandum was the last act of Sir Hector Hetherington's long and brilliant career. The Administrative Board learned with deep regret of his death on 14 January, 1965.

Although any quotation does less than justice to Sir Hector Hetherington's closely reasoned argument, which needs to be read fully and carefully, there is "full recognition of the principle that the duty of the universities is to serve the public interest, rightly conceived ; that their claim to a high degree of autonomy rests not on privilege, but on the teaching of experience; that only under that condition can they give the full measure of their service; and that they have no title to be exempt from public interest, judgement and criticism—on the contrary, that they use their freedom best when, under the stimulus of such judgement, they hold their policies under frequent review". (p. 28). Centuries of experience suggest that universities can best do the job expected of them by the community when they are free to make their own decisions in regard to the following matters:

1. Whatever the formalities of appointment may be, the university should have the right to select its own staff. (pp. 10-14).
2. The university should be responsible for the selection of its students. (pp. 14-17).
3. Universities should be responsible for the formulation of curricula for each degree and for the setting of academic standards. In those countries where degrees, or the licence to practise a profession, are regulated by law, universities should participate effectively in the formulation of curricula and the setting of academic standards. (pp. 17-21).
4. Each university should have the final decisions as to the research programme carried on within its walls. (pp. 21-23).
5. The university should be responsible, within wide limits, for the allocation among its various activities of the financial resources available, i.e. space and equipment; capital funds; recurrent operating revenue. (pp. 23-24).

In spite of the widely different conditions—economic, political and social—that exist in various parts of the world, and of the diversity of laws and constitutions that govern the operations of universities, the members of the Administrative Board (as their memoranda clearly indicate) are of the opinion that these five elements of university autonomy are essential—not as special privileges, but as the basic conditions that enable the universities of the world to perform effectively their triple function of educating young men and women to serve the needs of the community, conserving the heritage of culture and expanding the frontiers of knowledge by research.

Conscious, as they are, of the significance of university autonomy, the members of the Administrative Board are also keenly aware of the forces, already at work in many parts of the world, which may seriously endanger that autonomy.

Most widely recognized of these is the rapid expansion of higher education in our generation, which inevitably makes increasing demands upon the public purse. In every country of the world, the universities are asking for more money in order that they can satisfactorily perform the tasks imposed on them by the community: the number of their students has increased and the costs of operation have risen. More significantly still, universities as a group (in all countries) require a larger share of the Gross National Product—so that expenditures in other areas must be proportionately reduced if the university needs are to be met. There is real danger that, at some stage in this process of expanding higher education, legislatures and governments may wish to exercize a larger measure of detailed control over university operations. In some areas—the standardization of building costs, for example—this may be beneficial to the universities as well as to the community, but State control that diminishes university autonomy in any one of the five basic areas defined above may be exceedingly dangerous in the long run.

Other external influences—not directly related to financial support—may infringe university autonomy. Political instability in a country, followed by the rise of a dictatorship, may play havoc with its university institutions: there are many examples within the folk-memory of this generation.

But, seen from the angle of the university, "dictatorships" are not solely a phenomenon of revolution or of national governmental policy. Powerful groups, industrial or professional, sometimes seek to impose their will on universities, especially when questions of the employment of graduates or of the licence to practise a profession, are involved. In some cases, governments may listen to such groups, and enact legislation that vitally affects the operation of the universities, without fully consulting those institutions. It is not enough that individual professors have been consulted. One of the most difficult problems in the field of higher education arises out of the strong centrifugal forces that are at work in all fields of learning and science: professors of dentistry may agree with the proposals of a licensing body, physicians with a proposed training programme, although in the considered judgement of the university as a whole (and often in their own mature judgement after full discussion with their colleagues of all the implications) these proposals do not represent the wisest use of university resources in the long-run service of the community.

But all of the dangers do not come from outside. University autonomy may be jeopardized from within when organized political activity on the part of the student body—or on the part of members of the staff—antagonizes the government and encourages it to impose restrictions on the university. This subject is mentioned in more detail below.

Also from within the university arises the danger that particular faculties, departments or institutes—especially in the field of research—may initiate discussions and reach decisions in consultation with governments or other outside bodies before the university as a corporate society has had the opportunity to express an opinion or to relate these discussions to its general policy. This is, indeed, another aspect of the problem of centrifugal forces discussed above—since the pressures do not always come from outside the university. The tendency for professional groups—dentists, lawyers or physicians, for example—to consult with one another across the borders of their own universities is already well-developed, and increasing. The amount of money and the volume of political support available to such specialized groups is increasing even more rapidly, so that the pattern and policy of the whole university may be distorted by actions of this kind.

More insidious, perhaps, but equally dangerous to the concept of university autonomy is the tendency of some universities to look inward rather than to be continuously conscious of the needs of the community. Oxford and Cambridge fell into this habit during the nineteenth century, developing into closed societies of the kind reflected in the phrase about "ivory towers", and there are examples enough elsewhere. Indeed, any university that, over a long period of time, has developed its own characteristic organization and way of life can come to be insensitive to the mood of the community in which it operates. The price of autonomy—like that of liberty—is eternal vigilance both as to pressures from without and to indifference within. To fulfil their functions in the service of the community, universities need the freedom to choose their own mode of action as well as a continuous and critical awareness of the real needs of the communities they serve—which may not always be those that the community urges upon them so clamorously at a given moment of time.

So much for the autonomy of universities. Sir Hector Hetherington also mentions in his paper two other problems—separate from university autonomy, but sometimes confused with it—and comments regarding these are also found in the memoranda of members of the Administrative Board.

On pages 13 to 14, and again on pages 28 to 31, the question of academic freedom—of the right of a professor to speak the truth that lies in him—is discussed. This has been a thorny question at many times in history and in various countries of the world, but few will disagree with Sir Hector's conclusion that all members of the staff of a university should be assured of full academic freedom to express the considered opinions to which they may be led by their studies, no matter how unpopular those opinions may be in some quarters. It is equally apparent that each staff member, in his turn, must have a sense of his responsibility to add light rather than heat to public controversies.

Student claims to the right of self-government, which are discussed from pages 33 to 35, are equally valid when they relate to such matters as athletics, student clubs and the operation of student unions. These matters are of direct concern to students. They are largely within the competence of students, and there can be no question that the responsibilities assumed by students in these areas contribute to the development of individual character and maturity. It is also apparent that there should be regular channels of communication between students and senior members of the university to discuss common problems and present grievances. It is doubtful, to say the least, whether students can play an effective part in university government and it has already been pointed out that organized student agitation in the political arena can be dangerous rather than beneficial. Students have no special authority in these fields, nor have they greater experience than other young men and women. Excessive claims by the student body may jeopardize the autonomy of the university itself—of which the students are an integral part as junior members—even when it does not provoke undesirable reactions from the government and the community.

UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY

Sir Hector Hetherington

Former Principal and Vice-Chancellor
University of Glasgow

1. It is widely held that universities as corporate societies should enjoy and be assured of a high degree of autonomy, that they should be free to take the decisions necessary to their essential business by their own procedures and without constraint by external authority. There is a second related, but quite distinguishable claim—distinguishable since it can be made against the university as well as by it—that the members of their staffs should enjoy and be assured of a large measure of academic freedom, that each should be free to communicate in his teaching, and perhaps in a broader context as well, the conclusions however unorthodox or unpopular, to which he is led by his own studies and reflexions. I shall say something on this second claim, since in principle, it belongs to the same general issue. But the main topic of this paper is the former —the claim of the corporate university to substantial independence.

2. My purpose, as will appear, is entirely practical: so I shall spend little time on the interesting quasi-philosophical issues which arise, or could arise, in this connection. It is evident that in the context of modern society, no university makes or can make a claim to complete autonomy. It derives its legal existence from an act of some external authority, usually the State: and its instrument of incorporation prescribes in some detail what it may do and what it may not do—for example, in relation to its property or in its dealing with other institutions, or even with its own members. These, however, are relatively external requirements, defining the framework within which its more intimate and formative decisions have to be taken. Moreover, even in relation to these latter, it is not to be expected that the university can be free from external scrutiny and judgment. It might be so if the university possessed resources wholly within its own control sufficient for the maintenance of all its

undertakings. But even under that condition, as the nineteenth century experience of Oxford and Cambridge showed, financially independent colleges and universities were by no means exempt from pressure by Government to change their ways. And in this mid-twentieth century, very few universities are well enough endowed to maintain themselves. In all countries most universities, and in most countries all universities depend to a greater or less degree on continuing support from public funds, administered through a department of national and/or regional or local government. It is certain that this support will not and ought not to be forthcoming without some governmental study of the use to which the universities put the funds committed to them. Hence over a very large area of the world, the main question about university autonomy is really a question about the relation of universities and State. But the same issue can and does arise in the relation of the university to any other substantial contributor to its income. In England, municipalities which aid a neighbouring university from local taxation have on occasion tried to influence university policy by attaching conditions to their grants. Similarly the private universities of the United States are not without experience of pressures from associations of alumni and from large business corporations, whose contributions are sometimes an important element in the university budget. And no doubt, a Church which supports a denominational college or university, a Foundation, a private benefactor are all in a position to exert influence on the university's action. Wherever there is financial dependence, the issue of autonomy may arise.

3. It may therefore be assumed that whatever the varied pattern of earlier history, the university's claim to autonomy is not now an assertion of an inherent right to any peculiar status or privilege. The universities everywhere are institutions recognized and in the main supported by governments and by other authorities in order that they may perform a specific and important function. And if their claim to autonomy is to carry conviction, it must be founded on the circumstance that a high degree of autonomy is at least a favourable and may be a necessary condition of their adequate fulfilment of that function. No doubt it will be the more readily acknowledged because of the long tradition of independent authority enjoyed by the universities in the societies in which they first developed. But basically it rests on the conditions required for their full service here and now.

4. Reviewing a long observation of Universities and of their action, I am persuaded that so formulated and founded, the case for autonomy is well established. The claim is not for exemption from public accountability or from the duty to explain their policies and to have due regard to informed public judgment on them. It is simply that they are likely to fulfil their high service most adequately when the directives and judgments issuing from external authority are offered but not imposed, so that Universities have a large freedom in the choice of their objectives, and of the means to be taken thereto. In support, I may offer three considerations. The first is an appeal to contemporary fact. It is true that this claim is not everywhere conceded, true also that even in those

societies where for long it has been conceded, the present headlong changes in their economic and social structures and the recurrent pressures and crises so arising, may easily bring it under challenge. But it is nowhere totally denied or ignored. Even in those states where control is apt to be extensive, there is still a considerable, and usually a growing area where the Universities are left to take their own decisions. The second is from analogy. It will be granted that where the performance of function calls for the exercize of initiative and of creativity, freedom from external constraint is a desirable, indeed a necessary condition. An artist, for example, may have an assigned task—to paint a portrait, to design a building conforming to such and such requirements, to compose an anthem suitable to some national occasion. But no one would attempt to instruct an artist of quality how in detail he should execute his task. No worthy work of art could be produced under such direction; and no great work of art can be produced unless the artist is wholly free to do it in his own way. If therefore it be a condition of the making of any good work that it should be the outcome and expression of the experience and personality of its author, he had better be left to make his own choice of means, and to modify them according to his own assessment of the result. And that, I think, by and large, is the position of the best kind of university educator. As to research, it is clearly so. As to teaching, his function is not merely the communication of established knowledge. That is the beginning: and among his students there will be many for whom the intelligent mastery and use of existing knowledge is a sufficient goal. But among them also will be those of greater ability to whom the community must look for new knowledge and new applications of knowledge. And these are at the period of their lives when their intellectual and emotional powers and interests are unfolding, and when it is all-important that they should be encouraged and helped to exercize these powers to the full. They must be given a sense of the frontier and of what is beyond. That is a task for an imaginative and creative teacher, for one who has himself lived on the frontier, and is in his own way something of an explorer. No one will pretend that all university teachers are of this quality. There is a place in the university for less gifted and less original teachers. But if the university is to provide the conditions under which its eminent teachers can exert their influence—and on them in the long run, the quality of its service depends—it must nurture them in freedom, and therefore must itself be free.

The third is the record of Experience. It is certain that whatever the formal relation of the university to its environing authority, the greatest achievements of scholarship and science have been wrought by men who worked by themselves or in free association with others, or in universities which were in no decisive way subject to external control. But let it be noted, that that same testimony establishes also that for full health the universities must be sensitively aware of the national or regional tradition and purposes which they exist to serve, and to that end, need the invigorating stimulus of public interest and judgment. Rashdall's study of the universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, the plentiful books on Oxford and Cambridge, Paulsen's study of the German universities all point the same moral. Church and State, whichever was the pre-eminent power, were always apt to seek to use the universities to support and advance their own policies. The universities were often enough pawns in a game, distracted from their proper business of learning, limited in their initiatives, reduced to the torpor celebrated by Gibbon. On the other hand, the same condition can be induced if they become self-enclosed communities, preoccupied with their own privileges, perpetuating a restricted range of interests, indifferent to the world beyond their walls. The relation between universities and Government is thus always delicate. The State, assuredly, is concerned: it may have to impart a stimulus to self-reform, as in the Oxford of the nineteenth century. Bút in the memorable sentence of Wilhelm von Humbolt, the great Prussian Minister of Education, "The State should always bear in mind that it does not and cannot do the work of a university: and that it always becomes a hindrance when it interferes". And it may be added that the State itself is stronger when it holds in its universities independent centres of far-ranging thought. "The State", as Burke held, "is a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are dead and those who are to be born". It cannot escape a close concern with the issues of the immediate present. But these are not the whole. The universities share and ought to share its contemporary concerns. But they have it peculiarly in their care to look to the past and to the future. They are on the frontier: and therein lies the possibility of their special service. For that service, if they are to meet it worthily, they need their freedom.

5. I turn then to the specific intention of this paper—to try to elucidate in some detail what Autonomy means in terms of actual practice. Formally, a University is autonomous in the degree to which it is free to take within its own organization and by its own procedures, the decisions relating to its legislation and administration. But effective autonomy requires something more than is implied by this formal statement. It involves also that the organization of the University should be such as to assure to its working membership, especially to its academic staff, a recognized and influential part in the making of those decisions, particularly in the shaping of academic policies. In the end, that is the heart of the matter.

I propose therefore to identify the decisions which have to be made, and to say something also of the constitutional procedures by which they are normally made in the University systems of which I have some experience. I recognize that what I write will not be universally applicable, since I know at first hand only the British and to some extent, the Commonwealth and American systems. But since even within that limited range, there are important differences in the scope and organization of University undertakings, and in the environing social, political and economic conditions, this analysis may not be wholly out of relation to other systems. It is, I think, reasonably certain that all over the world the term 'University' is coming to hold a sufficiently common connotation to give a fair measure of generality to this discussion.

6. That being so, we may first consider what a university is and does. Definitions abound. The ground is pretty well covered by Article I of the Rules of Procedure adopted by the International Association of Universities concerning application for membership of the Association. But I quote two others: Alexander of Manchester began thus a notable article in the *Political Quarterly* (September 1931):

"I should describe a university as an association or corporation of scholars and teachers engaged in acquiring, communicating, or advancing knowledge, pursuing in a liberal spirit the various sciences which are a preparation for the professions or higher occupations of life. The omission of any part of this description would convey a false impression of what a university is".

Karl Jaspers writes: (1)

"The university is a community of scholars and students engaged in the task of seeking truth" ..... "Three things are required of a university, professional training, education of the whole man, research. For a university is simultaneously a professional school, a cultural centre, a research institution".

7. If we look at all three of those accounts, the central and agreed elements are these:

i) The university is a community of scholars and students, of seniors and juniors.

ii) It is concerned with knowledge, particularly with the branches of knowledge required for the full exercize of a variety of higher professional callings—this *variety* being an important consideration, since the university is a meeting place of different disciplines.

iii) It both communicates and advances these disciplines, its objective being the discovery and better understanding of truth.

iv) Its work, therefore, cannot be narrowly utilitarian and sectional in outlook. It is infused with a liberality of spirit, calculated to encourage scholars by mutual enlightenment and criticism to look to the unity of knowledge, to be aware of its place in the totality of the values of human experience and thereby to contribute to the "education of the whole man" and to the maintenance and enrichment of the culture within which the university exists.

From these four functions it follows that:

v) The staff and the students of the universities must be of the intellectual calibre and must have undergone the preliminary preparation to enable them to meet the requirements of their respective parts in this joint undertaking.

8. If this complex of purposes is to be in some perceptible measure realized five main sets of questions have to be determined. These relate to:

i) The selection and appointment of the senior members of the university—its teachers, researchers and administrators.

ii) The selection of its students of various grades.

---

(1) *The Idea of the University*, pp. 19 and 53.

iii) The objectives and therefore the patterns of the curricular programmes which the students will pursue, and of the standards of attainment to be required for the award of its degrees and diplomas.

iv) The choice of its research programmes.

v) The assessment of the facilities required and the allocation of resources, (*i.e.* of space, of recurrent income and of capital funds) between different interests, services and activities.

Each of these five main sets of questions subdivides into further questions. They are, in fact, and for a variety of reasons, answered in different ways in different places. Our interest at the moment is not in trying to answer them in detail, but in noting that the issue of autonomy arises precisely in the procedures by which in each case the relevant decision is taken.

9. But before we undertake the analysis of these procedures we may note that universities themselves display a variety of constitutional patterns, so that viewed from the outside, universities appear to be rather different kinds of organisms. It is possible to distinguish three or four main types.

a) A few universities are, quite strictly, simply corporations of scholars and students, *i.e.* their governing bodies are composed wholly of the senior members of their academic and administrative staffs. For all practical purposes the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin are in that position. All the affairs both of their Colleges and of the Universities themselves are in the hands of resident and stipendiary members of their staffs. On none of their statutory bodies, save in a purely honorific way, is any outside authority represented. No greater degree of autonomy can be imagined than that enjoyed by these universities. Yet, as has been noted, they are not entirely exempt from scrutiny and if need be from certain compulsions of Government: and like other universities in Britain, they are largely dependent on State funds and therefore subject if not to control, at least to influence.

b) At apparently the opposite end of the spectrum is the situation of most universities of North America, where, as I understand it, the general constitutional pattern whether in private or of State universities entrusts final legislative and executive authority to an exclusively lay body of Trustees or Regents of which the President may or may not be a member, but which, apart from him, contains no representative of the academic staff.[*] This is, of course, far from being the whole truth of the position. If not by statute, then by custom built up over the years, the academic body is entitled to be consulted, either directly, or through representative committees, on most major issues of policy and on appointments: while on many matters of curricular detail it is, in effect, sovereign. Certainly, nowadays, in no major university institution, is there any disposition to overlook the claim of the academics to some considerable share in the management of the university. Nevertheless the legal supremacy and omni-competence of the lay Board is an important fact and lays upon the President a burden of personal responsibility and authority much greater than that borne by the academic head of any British (or of almost any other) university.

---

[*] This lay body is variously composed; in a State University, it may be wholly appointed by the Governor or by the State legislature or by electoral vote: in a Church-related university, by the authorities of the founding and supporting Church, so that it may include clerical and lay members: in private universities it is usually self-perpetuating, with sometimes a strong infusion of alumni chosen by alumni votes.

c) Apart from Oxbridge, the normal British pattern (operative throughout the Commonwealth) assigns all effective legal authority to a single Council or Court which in Britain, though the case is otherwise in the new Commonwealth States, rarely contains any representative of the central government—the main financial support of the universities.* But it does contain a) as well as the Vice-Chancellor (corresponding to the President or Rector) representatives of the academic staff, appointed by that staff: and b) a considerable preponderance of members drawn from outside the universities, representing, for example, local professional and business experience, and the authorities responsible for the provision of the non-university educational institutions of the university area. Moreover, on matters of major policy, on curricular matters or on the appointment of academic staff, this mixed Council can usually act only after consultation with some relevant academic body: and the senior academic body (generally called the Senate) is constitutionally entitled to express to the Council its view on any matter affecting the welfare of the university. In practice, therefore, the academic body, though in law subordinate, has a great deal of influence on the course of academic affairs.

d) As to constitutional forms and practice elsewhere than in the Commonwealth and North America, it is beyond my competence to offer more than a somewhat hazardous generalization. The many constitutional documents (from all the continents) which I have read exhibit some similarity of pattern. But they exhibit also a bewildering variety of detail: and in any event the interpretation of these documents requires an understanding both of the legal and juridical structure of the several States and, perhaps even more importantly, of the usages, traditions and conventions which largely determine the relationship and actual working of their public institutions. Perhaps, however, under risk of correction, this much may be said.

In most countries, both State (or public) and private universities are to be found, though many of the private universities draw much of their financial support from the State. Of the private universities the majority, though not all, are confessional foundations, mostly Roman Catholic, and therefore under the immediate control of the appropriate ecclesiastical authorities. In most countries, however, certainly in Europe, the State university is the predominant type—in Germany and in Norway, for example, the only type. And in the nature of the case, this type will tend to prevail in most other countries which are engaged in developing their university systems. But this public authority—university relationship is maintained in different ways and through different agencies. France, for example, has a relatively integrated system of educational administration. Under the broad direction and supervision of the central Ministry of National Education, all the public institutions of primary, secondary and higher education in each of its nineteen educational districts (Académies) are grouped into an administrative unity. The capital of each district is the seat of a university: and the Rector of the university, a government official appointed by the President of the Republic, is also Rector of the Académie.

---

* See para. 16 d for a note on the propriety of Government-appointed members of a university Council or Court.

Elsewhere, for the most part, the relation of State to university is more specific. In Switzerland and Holland, for example, each university has its own Board of Curators to which the public authority appoints at least a majority of members—much in the fashion of the Regents of an American State university. In most countries, however, such public control as is thought to be necessary is exercized by a department of the central or regional government, usually by a Ministry of Education or of Higher Education. Normally the Ministry deals directly with the university: but sometimes, as in Sweden, communications pass through an officer of government attached to the university.

But more important than the mechanism of the relationship is the degree to which control is actually exercized. Everywhere, of course, scrutiny and approval of the Budget is required: and the university is made aware of the kinds and standard and direction of the services which it is expected to perform. And that occurs also with those private universities which are substantially dependent on State finance. The more crucial question is as to the measure in which the Ministry or other public authority discharges at its own hand business which intimately affects the domestic working of the university. It is clear that practice varies greatly, and that the written relationship gives no certain clue to the answer. In the articulated and centralized system of France, for example, the public universities in fact enjoy a great measure of freedom. The Rector is appointed to his double office by the President of the Republic. But the President invariably appoints a university professor, who is likely to uphold the university's authority and privilege. And so it is in most countries with appointments to professorships and other senior offices. The appointment rests with the Minister: quite often, as in Germany and Norway, the professor is in law a civil servant. But only rarely does the Minister do more than select from a very short list of names recommended by the university, and mostly his action is simply to confirm the one name submitted by the university.

Similarly also with the organization and standards of the courses offered by the university. In France these are in general conformity with the prescription of the Ministry but, even there, the presentation and order of teaching is very much a matter for the individual professor. Indeed, in work of university standard, any other system would be impracticable.

The fundamental point is that whatever the statutory relationship between public authority and university, the university has its own corporate life and personality. It has its own internal agency of government to regulate its domestic affairs: and wherever the university is vigorous, that agency is well able to play an effective part in its external relations. The agency takes different constitutional forms. It may be a large academic Senate, or a smaller Council or Consistorium or Faculty. But in all cases it includes, as its president, the Rector—an academic personage appointed to that office for a longer or shorter period of time, sometimes by Government but more usually by the vote of his academic colleagues—together with the other principal academic officers, such as the Deans of Faculties and some representatives of the professoriate. It is therefore either wholly or mainly academic in composition. No important business affecting the teaching or research of the university can be transacted without its participation: and in some universities, as in Oslo and in the National Universities of Mexico and Brazil, the autonomy of the "collegium academicum" is expressly guaranteed by the statute of foundation.

In summary, therefore, it may properly be said that within the wide system of publicly controlled universities, many different constitutional patterns are to be found, and that even apparently similar patterns work in different ways. But it seems also that within the framework of public responsibility, it normally happens that the body which represents and expresses academic opinion participates actively in the discussion of major matters of university policy. That, indeed, is widely and rightly recognized as an essential condition of a true university life: and it may be a fair conclusion to say that the more mature the political and academic institutions of the country, the more substantial is the influence of the academic body on the course of university action.

10. One further word may be added on this matter of constitutions. We have noted that the working of any constitution depends in part on the conventions and understandings which have developed within it. It depends also on the personalities who, at any given time, are occupied with a university's affairs. Most governing bodies, Senates or Councils, contain individuals or groups who enjoy university politics: and when a few such people contrive to work assiduously together, they can exercize an influence altogether out of proportion either to their numbers or often to their collective wisdom—a phenomenon by no means confined to academic assemblies.

In any consideration of autonomy it is necessary to have in mind this variety of pattern and operation, since clearly under some of these conditions, autonomy can be invaded or undermined not only from outside the university but from within. Wherever it happens that powerfully placed academic personalities use their influence unduly to promote the interests of their own departments or that members of University Councils appointed by external organizations (including Government) act similarly to move the decisions of the university towards the objectives and policies of the nominating interests, autonomy is under threat. These external lay members can be, and usually are, a source of great strength to the university, bringing a wide range of experience and judgment to bear on its affairs, and also helping to interpret and defend to the community at large the purposes and intentions of the universities. But this service can be given only if, in their actions as university councillors, they regard themselves not as delegates of the appointing authority but as contributors to the general stock of university experience and wisdom, concerned on each issue to reach the decision conducive to the efficiency and welfare of the university itself. If they take any other line than this, they are acting not as members of a university governing body, responsible for the welfare of the university, but as proponents of some external interest.

Hence, when hereafter I speak of decisions taken by the university, I assume—as is, I believe, in general though not universally the case—that this condition is met. To the extent to which it is not met, autonomy is unreal.

11. *The material decisions.* With these general patterns and considerations in mind, we may now look in detail at the decisions to be taken in the course of normal university business. As has been indicated, the degree to which a university is or is not autonomous is to be measured by the extent to which these decisions are or are not taken by the university itself, through the mechanism appropriate thereto.

The first issue, and one of the most critical, relates to the selection and appointment of the senior officers of the university—its titular and ceremonial head where such an officer exists, its executive academic head, its principal administrative officers, Deans or others, its professors and senior teachers, its directors of research. The powers and duties of these several officers are normally defined by the constitution of the university: and the significance of the mode of election depends upon the functions to be exercized by each of the officers concerned.

There are two different sets of questions here—those relating to the appointment of officers and those relating to the appointment of academic staff. The former is a more general, the latter a more specialist function, so that the autonomy of the university is expressed in rather different ways.

a) In all British universities, and in many in the Commonwealth, the highest office is that of Chancellor. He alone is appointed for life: but his office is, in general, one of dignity rather than authority. He presides over the great public occasions of the university, but is seldom involved in its day-to-day business. Sometimes it happens, especially in some younger universities, that he has certain specific powers—as, for example, the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor or executive academic head. But this is unusual, and where it exists is probably to be taken as a more or less temporary situation. Normally the Chancellor's real contribution to the university is as a reserve figure in the background, who can if need be intervene in an issue on which the university itself is seriously divided, and can exercize there through the respect commanded by his personality and his office, a persuasive reconciling influence.

To that end, it is clearly desirable that the Chancellor should be a man or woman of acknowledged eminence in public or in academic life, and that he should be acceptable to the university as a whole: and it is better that he should not be closely involved in public business of a highly controversial character. (Several British universities have appointed members of the Royal Family.) Chancellors are in fact chosen in different ways; sometimes, as in the older British universities, by the vote of the whole registered membership of the university. The actual mechanism of election perhaps is not of the first importance. What is important from the point of view of autonomy, and indeed from the point of view of the influence of the office itself, is that the Chancellor should not be felt to be imposed upon the university, but rather appointed after some consultation with all sections of opinion, lay, academic and graduate membership alike, so that in the measure in which this can be achieved, the Chancellor is an acceptable and representative head of the society and enjoys the prestige conferred by that fact.

b) In most universities which have a lay or a mixed lay and academic Governing Body, the second lay (and non-stipendiary) officer is the Chairman of that body. In some Canadian universities he is designated Chancellor. The usual title in Britain is Pro-Chancellor. This officer has much more concern with the ordinary business of the university than has the dignitary mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The mode of appointment varies. Sometimes he is chosen by the Governing Body itself: sometimes, as in many American State universities by the Governor or the Legislature of the State: sometimes by the whole body of graduates: sometimes, (as in England) by a widely representative University Court which at its annual meeting nominates a considerable proportion of the Executive Governing Body. Whatever the mode of appointment, his serviceability and success clearly depend on his having two qualities. As a layman of standing in public or in business life, he brings to the material business of the university the valuable contribution of his own experience. But even in the consideration of these matters, and still more in the consideration of those academic policies which affect finance or require the approval of the Governing Body, he needs also a sympathetic understanding of the ideals and conditions of university work. Otherwise the free and instructive exchange of opinion and experience will be difficult: and some failure of mutual confidence may arise.

There is no prescription for ensuring an appointment of the right kind. But again it is clear that in the process of election some soundings should be taken of a fairly wide sample of university opinion as to the acceptability of the several possible incumbents. The whole university should feel that so important an officer has the attitude of mind which will make him welcome. His effectiveness will be all the greater if from the beginning he has this broadly based claim on the interest and loyalty of those who are to be associated with him in his work.

c) Even more important is the choice of the executive academic head of the university, the Vice-Chancellor or Rector or President, however he may be designated. It does not lie in his hands to determine university policy, but as the central figure in its administration he has a powerful hand in shaping it, and in ensuring its smooth and effective application.

There have been a few examples of successful appointments made from outside the ranks of practising academics, but almost all of these few have been men who had previously had distinguished academic careers. There can be no doubt that two of the essential qualifications of an academic head is that his proven intellectual calibre should command the respect of his academic colleagues, and that either from his own experience or from an intuitive sympathy, he should have some perceptive understanding of their work and values. He must have other qualities as well. He must be sensitive to the public needs to which his university should respond, and discriminative in his judgment of its response. He must be effective in business, able to create or to sustain an orderly process of deliberation and action. He must have a policy and the ability to commend it. There is therefore here a delicate balance between executive and academic qualities: and it is altogether right that both elements in the university should be involved in the choice. The best procedure would appear to be that while the right of appointment should rest finally with the Governing Body, that body should call into consultation a group of experienced representative academics and be assured that its proposed appointment commands a sufficient body of convinced academic support. In any reasonably mature institution, resentment and difficulty would ensue if its principal officer were merely imposed from without. It would certainly be the negation of autonomy.

d) Appointments to professorships or other senior academic posts raise less complex issues. In this matter, and in the choice of all ranks of the academic staff, the executive head of the university takes an important part normally as the custodian of the general university as distinct from the departmental interest. It is one of the most significant of all his duties. The interest of the university is to get, from the available field, the men best qualified to fulfil the varied duties of the professorial office —teaching, research, the direction of research, the capacity to advise on such public issues as may lie within the sphere of his professional competence. Hence, the primary duty of the governing body is to assure itself that every effort has been made to meet that requirement. It may reasonably define the field of eligibility. For example, in a country which is building up its own academic strength, responsible opinion may properly think it better policy to prefer the best of its own nationals to a more highly qualified candidate from elsewhere—always provided that its own national is good enough for the office. Subject to that proviso, there are good reasons for this course. Without that proviso, the policy would defeat itself. Far better to import, if need be on a limited contract, than to risk the perpetuation of sub-standard attainment. In the judgment of academic fitness, academic opinion should prevail—the opinion of professors of associated subjects in the institution itself reinforced (as usually happens in all countries) by external academic advice from authorities elsewhere. But while there is nothing to be said for selection by an exclusively non-academic body, there is a good deal to be said for lay participation in the business of selection. Academics are sometimes apt to attach almost too much importance to the research and publication record of the candidates—a very important aspect of the matter, but not the only one which has to be brought into the reckoning. Teaching power, general good sense, and personal stability are very relevant considerations, and the judgment of the lay members of a selection committee is often helpful in these matters. Autonomy is well-served when both points of view are presented on the Selection Committee.

e) As to junior academic appointments, the main responsibility should lie with an academic committee in association with the executive head of the university, though the governing body should be free to call for any information which it wishes to have and, if it sees fit, to withhold confirmation.

f) As to senior administrative officers, the appointment of all officers concerned with finance, buildings, grounds, purchasing, should be a matter for the governing body, acting very much on the advice and recommendation of the executive head of the university. He should have a large discretion in the assignment of duties and responsibilities. On the purely academic side the pattern of administration varies so widely that any general rule is hard to come by. The academic bodies should certainly have some share in any major decanal or other appointment. But any long-term appointment should equally require the assent of the executive head and of the Governing Body.

g) But as regards the appointment of all senior staff, the most difficult questions arise less in selection than in the determination of conditions of tenure and in the assessment of the adequacy of the performance of members of staff. These appointments are generally intended to be permanent. It is, however, quite certain that however much care is taken, a few unsuccessful or unfortunate choices will be made. A man may lose his health or his interest in his work, or fall into some serious personal disrepute. It is essential, therefore, that from the beginning, a publicly-known procedure should be established for the review and, if need be, the termination of an appointment in such cases as may appear to the Governing Body to call for reconsideration.

There are, of course, some posts to which incumbents are appointed, for a fixed period of years, with the clear understanding that at the end of that period, there is no presumption at all of renewal. That, however, is not a device capable of wide application. If good men are to be drawn into university service, they must have an assurance of continuity of tenure up to a prescribed normal age of retirement. And whatever the formal terms of the contract may be, there is in all western countries a powerful and respected tradition that no tenure will be prematurely terminated except after a judicial procedure in which some senior academics participate, designed to establish sufficient grounds for so serious a step. It is quite vital to autonomy that that procedure should be under the control of the university itself.

The greatest difficulty arises over marginal cases. A total break-down in health or a clear conviction on a criminal offence can be dealt with under ordinary rules or conventions. But partial incapacity or dwindling energy which does not prevent apparent compliance with duty are harder to meet. Sometimes there is not very much that can be done about either and, if the case is not extreme it is often better to put up with an indifferent performance than to risk the odium of a terminative procedure. This always is a matter of judgment—really choosing the lesser of two evils. The most difficult case of all, however, is that in which a university teacher renders himself obnoxious to public opinion by his championship of political or religious views which offend the feeling of the majority of his fellow critizens, and which may even be held to be contrary to the national interest.

There is, of course, no reason why a university teacher should not be subject to the ordinary laws of the State of which he is a citizen, or be exempt in this respect (or in any other) from the ordinary procedures of the law. That is a matter of public not university administration: and so long as the alleged offence is adequately investigated and judged by the normal processes of the civil law, his university status is no protection. The situation, however, is otherwise when no legal offence is in question and when because of the unpopularity of a professor's opinions external authority seeks to compel the university to terminate an appointment or to take other restrictive action beyond that which the university is disposed to take of its own motion. A university has proper ground of complaint and if need be of action if a staff member misuses his office to propagate in the class-room views which are irrelevant to his subject. But a university must be extremely careful not to interfere with the ordinary citizen rights of its members: and in relation to a man's teaching ought not to be moved by the unpopularity of any views on matters within his professional competence to which he is responsibly led. The university's sovereign concern is with the discovery of truth. New truth or a new interpretation of an old truth is often enough unpopular with the adherents of received opinion. But attempted suppression is nearly always wrong. If the offending opinion be mistaken, its falsity will be exposed in other and better ways. Hence, if within any given area of enquiry a doctrine be rationally held and rationally defended with full knowledge of the grounds on which others dissent from it, its unpopularity is no ground for adverse university action. If the staff member has this measure of protection, he has, of course, correspondingly serious obligations, on which I shall say something later.* The main point here is that so long as no charge can be brought in the civil courts, university autonomy requires that such issues be left without constraint to the university itself.

12. *Selection of students:* On this matter three major decisions have to be taken. Whatever more it may be, a university is a place of preparation for entrants to the professions and higher occupations, concerned primarily to communicate the fundamental scientific knowledge necessary to the intelligent and effective exercize of a specific calling.

a) The first question is for what professions should a university cater?

---

* See para. 17.

No rule of principle is here involved other than that implicit in the above statement—viz., that the greater part of the course should consist of serious and relevant advanced academic studies. Save quite exceptionally, the resources of the university should not be occupied with elementary courses. But under that proviso, any profession which calls for an advanced intellectual or theoretical preparation may suitably be included in a university programme.

What will in fact find a place depends on the range of professions of which the State stands in need, on its general educational provision and on the resources of which the university disposes. University autonomy implies that the university should itself have the final decision as to what it will or will not undertake to do. On the other hand, an issue of public importance is here at stake: and the university may reasonably expect and should receive with attention representations on this matter, both from the organized professions themselves which are anxious to provide a sound educational experience for their entrants and also from Government which will have knowledge of the State's professional needs, and is concerned to see that the professions are adequately staffed. A university should be on its guard against accepting responsibility for callings which, however useful, need no serious scientific or scholarly foundation. But if the required service is consonant with its academic standards, and if it is furnished with the resources to render it, then a university should be slow to refuse the call. In actual fact, few universities are likely to refuse any proper demand—the temptation is possibly the other way, to undertake a rather wider spread of commitment than it can sufficiently carry. But the main point is that in this decision other bodies than the universities and particularly the State have a strong interest and, though they should not seek to impose, they have every right to make their views known.

b) A more difficult matter is the determination of the standards of preliminary attainment to be required of entrants to the university. The universities' duty and interest is to see that these are set at as high a point as in the circumstances of its community is reasonably possible. But there is also to be considered the broader interest of the community as a whole and, in particular, of its pre-university educational system in seeing that the standard is not impossibly high. Too high a standard may impose a severe strain on the school system, and cause it to give too little attention to its non-university pupils. This therefore is not a matter which the university can settle entirely of its own motion. The university is under an obligation to consult with the schools and the State educational administration, and to consider the effect of its own requirements on the total educational service of the community. Methodical, systematic and thorough instruction is more important than the actual standard of attainment: and especially in countries in which the educational system is in course of development, the university may well be content for a period of time to aim at solidity rather than at ambitious academic attainment, when by so doing it can help the schools to establish their programmes and gradually raise their standards.

[illegible] variation of this question arises over the particular qualifications to be required for admission to specific professional courses. It is clear that a student cannot profitably enter upon a course in Agriculture or Medicine or Engineering without a more adequate attainment in science than need be demanded of an entrant to courses in the Humanities or in Law. And it may well be that in developing countries many schools with their wider commission will be unable, to begin with, to provide science courses of the necessary standard. It would be futile and disastrous to permit insufficiently prepared students to embark on such university courses: and yet wrong to exclude from them students who have shown the capacity to reach that standard. The solution therefore is for the universities to be ready, as an emergency measure, to provide for those students who need them the preliminary qualifying courses. From one point of view this is wasteful of university resources: but, for a space of time, it is less wasteful than either to reject able students or to compel the schools into undertakings beyond their capacity. The material point is that in all such issues, the university is bound to seek the solution which is in the interests not of itself alone, but of the national educational system of which it forms a part. In the long run, its interest is identical with that of the schools and of the community—that its students should have as well-rounded a school education as possible, and it should not seek to impose on the school standards of attainment in special subjects which might adversely affect that broader aim.

d) Granted, then, that in its decision as to the professions for which it will prepare, and as to the standard of the preliminary qualifications to be required for admission to these professional or specialist courses, and granted also that particularly in countries where the educational system is not yet fully developed, the university will have sympathetic regard to the need to help that development by offering for some time such infra-university instruction as will qualify promising students to enter upon a university course, there remains a further question as to the total size of the university commitment. How many students in all ought it to admit to each of its undergraduate courses or to the university as a whole? What is the optimum size of the university?

There is no received doctrine on this matter, or as to the balance which ought to be maintained between its different constituent elements. Practice varies all the way from some of the enormous State institutions in North and South America, qualitatively superb in their higher reaches but wasteful in their lower reaches, to the generally preferred British minimum of 3,000 students and maximum of 7,000 or 8,000, with their more even standard of attainment. The question is, therefore, hardly capable of theoretical discussion, and is perhaps unlikely to arise for some considerable time in a developing university system. It is, however, a question of some importance, which, sooner or later, every university has to face. Size has its advantages of which universities are well aware. They ought to contain a considerable range of studies and specialisms: and perhaps it is in general true that universities are apt to attempt too much rather than too little. But in a very large university contacts and activities tend to become over-departmentalized. Hence it is always important that it should have facilities—Unions, common-rooms, residences and the like—where cross-sections of the whole society, senior and junior, inevitably meet together. Even so, it remains that size as such, the spread of the campus over a very large area, has an effect upon the life of the university and upon the character and quality of its influence.

No one can say in advance when a point has been reached at which a university should resist a further enlargement either of a particular field of study, or of its total membership. All that can be said is that it should be both sensitive to the national need for a sufficient supply of graduates, and careful as to their quality, and the quality of its general service. Responsible external opinion, aware of expanding needs, may properly bring these firmly to the notice of the university. But the ultimate decision should be taken, without constraint, by the university itself. The attainment of real excellence in its work, and therefore of the conditions of excellence, is of greater public moment than the quantity of its immediate output. Of these conditions in its own situation, the university is likely to be the most reliable judge.

e) In this context, there is one further question on which a word should be said. Is it consistent with the idea of a publicly supported university that it should require from its entrants any other qualification than intellectual fitness? Clearly a university may properly require evidence that a student's presence will not endanger the health of other members of the university, and that he will conform to the general public health regulations of the community. He should be required also to observe the tolerable standard of social behaviour on which the efficient working of any community depends. But, in general, aside from such elementary requirements, it seems right that the university should be accessible to all who are fit to make good use of the opportunity which it offers. Exclusion on grounds of race or of religious or political belief or of any idiosyncracy of private opinion is contrary to the notion of the university as an intellectually vigorous and hospitable society. It ought not to be anxious to protect itself against the clash of opinion. There are, of course, publicly supported universities founded on a confessional basis, some of them of very high standing. Their autonomy would be invaded if they were denied the right to impose a confessional test either upon their staff or their students. But to the extent to which they do so, they imperil that openness of thought and of discussion which is the life-blood of good teaching and research: and in practice, except in limited areas of study, most of them insist upon no such test, especially upon their student entrants: and they are the stronger for this catholicity.

13. *The determination of curricula.* The student being selected, a further series of decisions has to be considered—as to what the university seeks to do with them, *i.e.* as to its educational programmes, and therefore as to content of its various courses.

a) By common consent, one objective, though not the whole, is to train competent recruits to the main professional services by communicating in respect of each profession the body of specialized knowledge required to that end. The principal curricular patterns are thereby determined—the prospective lawyer looking to the study of the various branches of law, their history and their rationale. So also with the doctor, the veterinarian, the agricultural scientist, the teacher, the engineer, the minister of religion, the economist, the administrator, and all the rest. In each of these areas, a large measure of common practice prevails. There are differences of order, of emphasis, of mode of presentation: but by and large, there is no great difference as to the necessary elements of the basic intellectual equipment of a practitioner of any of these callings.

It might be thought that in this respect university autonomy is safe. But that is not quite the end of the matter. For others besides the university are interested in the content of the courses provided. In many countries, 'recognition' as a qualified practitioner has to be obtained from some agency of the State, or from an organized professional institution. A university may confer its own degree in Medicine, or in Law or in Engineering or in any one of a dozen fields. But it rests with an external body to decide to what extent, or under what further conditions, that degree will be accepted as a licence to practise. There is, therefore, a strong pressure on the university to bring its curricular requirements closely into line with the requirements of this external organization, so that its graduates may be admitted to their professional status with the minimum of difficulty. It has to be acknowledged that differences of opinion do sometimes arise. They are indeed to be expected, especially at the outset of a new venture.

These differences, moreover, are significant, since they spring from a difference in the approach and intention of the university on the one hand and of the professional organization on the other. The latter tends to be concerned with the practical competence of its entrants, with their technical expertise, and know-how. The university is concerned with their fundamental scholarly and scientific knowledge, and is indisposed to spend precious university time in giving instruction in some subjects and techniques which have some importance from a practical point of view, but which have little intellectual solidity, and offer little intellectual nourishment. The standpoint of both parties, each from its own point of view, is well founded: and as a rule, when they come to understand one another better, accommodation can be reached. The university credential is accepted for what it is—a guarantee of scholarly or scientific attainment. But the external authority may preface full professional 'recognition' by the requirement of a period of in-service training, designed to supplement the university course, and to ensure the necessary professional experience and competence. Both parties stand to gain by the achievement of this mutual understanding. But any profession which desires to recruit university graduates to its service must come in the end to acknowledge the right of the universities to think first in terms of the intellectual quality of its courses, and its duty to provide for all its students as broad and full an educational experience as is possible.

b) This discussion brings into view a question of deeper importance. It is here implied that while the great majority of students come to the universities with the intention of entering some specific profession and while their courses are designed with this in view, the university's concern with them is something other than a simple professional preparation. It has not much concern with expertise: it has a strong concern with adequate attainment in the academic disciplines relevant to the professions. Does its concern extend beyond that? Ought it to aim not just at ensuring that they have the necessary specialized knowledge, but that in the course of acquiring that knowledge, they become in some sense well and widely educated men and women? There is a difference: and the difference is momentous.

Opinion, even university opinion, is not unanimous on this issue. In the United States, the Liberal Arts College is the expression of one view. The European habit is perhaps towards university specialization. It is held that although in earlier days general education was a necessary part of the university's purpose, that it is no longer valid. School life is lengthening and provides a greater range of educational experience. On the other hand, the knowledge needed for professional service is increasingly specialized: and its communication requires all the time and energy of which the university disposes. The university, therefore, should be content to leave general education to the schools, and to limit itself to instruction in a relatively narrow field of specialized knowledge. It is not germane to the practical purpose of this essay to argue this issue in detail. All that is relevant is to point out that it is there, and that the consideration of it goes to the very heart of university autonomy. For it is a quite fundamental issue of educational policy which must affect all the university's curricular decisions But I am constrained to make four brief observations.

First, the university's concern with general and liberal education is not simply a matter of history. It is powerfully operative today: and is indeed one of the marks which distinguishes the university from an institution for practical or technical training—a distinction which, in the general as well as its own interest, the university should be slow to abandon or obscure. It is not a question of standards of attainment or of the title or standard of the offered award. It is a question of broad public intention. Second, if that commission be not accepted, there is the less reason for the university's claim to control the curricula for its 'professional' degrees. Third, acceptance consorts well with the conception that the university should serve the national need. For the nation needs not only well-instructed professionals: it needs, even more, enlightened citizens, men and women who have some understanding of the problems of modern society, and can bring to bear on them a reasoned, objective judgment. And fourth, in face of the rapidly increasing specialization of all branches of science and scholarship, and of the demands for greater specialist knowledge, this commission is very hard to fulfil. It is easy for the university to pay only lip-service to it, and to allow this broader liberal intention to be crowded out.

Fulfilment requires that in all his specialist studies, the learner has to be helped to an awareness of the relation of these studies to one another, and to the whole geography of humane science and scholarship. That is difficult to achieve, and is never fully achieved. But even the intention counts: and much experiment has shown that at least for the more gifted students, there are margins and methods which can be used in this way, provided that a sufficiency of good teachers are in earnest about it. If that condition is not satisfied, there is little prospect that a university will be a place of real education.

Perhaps, indeed, it should be noted that (as will be evident from the definitions quoted in paragraph 6) this broader purpose is related in some minds to an even wider question—whether it belongs to the business of the university to communicate to its undergraduates a point of view, a coherent philosophy of life and conduct. This again is not for detailed discussion here. In some countries (as, for example, universally in the communist states) it is deliberately taken as a matter of course, and prosecuted with the utmost vigour. And in many universities in the West, it is at least an aspiration. There are few universities anywhere which would not desire that in the course of their educational experience, their undergraduates should make their way to some settled and central convictions which are a pre-requisite of an effective adult life. Most universities and colleges indeed do build up over the years a cherished tradition and outlook of their own. The difference is that they do not seek to impose it. They see it rather as a slow unconscious growth, the creation not of a set purpose but of the influence of an environing civilization and of the greater figures in their own history, the men of different professions and beliefs who have lived and learned in them, and have left their imprint on them. It makes its effect not by express instruction or obligatory requirement, but by the custom and spirit of a society which distils its characteristic quality from the free expression of different insights and points of view. What emerges is an unpredictable fact of history, built only by the processes of time.

c) On this matter of educational programmes, there remains the final question of determining the standards to be set for the university's awards. It is clear that in this matter, no university can do just as it pleases. Other bodies have an interest in the maintenance of reasonable and consistent standards—not least the university community as a whole, which would suffer in public repute by any debasement of the credit-worthiness of university awards. Similarly the State, and those professional institutions which accord *pro tanto* recognition to university degrees are bound to satisfy themselves that those awards mean what they profess to mean, and that they are not lightly accorded. But experience has shown that these assurances can be given without any kind of detailed supervision over or interference with the procedures by which the university customarily settles these decisions. In Britain, for example, certain statutory 'registering' bodies like the General Medical Council or the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons are empowered to 'inspect' university degree examinations at intervals of five years: and similar procedures are followed in other countries. If any of these bodies were to report unfavourably on university methods or standards of examination, the recognition of the university degree would be withdrawn. There is therefore a sanction. But that issue rarely or never arises. If a weakness is discovered, the report of the visiting inspectors is brought to the notice of the university and opportunity afforded for remedy. These reports so communicated are as a rule helpful to the university in the management of this aspect of its business: and broadly speaking no difficulty is experienced in maintaining over the system as a whole acceptable and consistent standards. Variations, no doubt, occur, especially in countries like the United States which have many degree-granting colleges of very different resources. Examining is notoriously not a highly perfected art. But, as a rule, two or more examiners are engaged in the process of assessment, one of whom frequently is drawn from some other university. Hence, overall, there is a reasonable assurance of a fair result and of the maintenance over the whole university system of a generally well-understood standard.

British experience on this matter is perhaps particularly worthy of study, since in that system one university—London—has long been authorized to examine and to confer degrees not only upon its own students but on candidates who have studied elsewhere. London has found that the most reliable results are attained by associating with the curricular and examination processes, wherever it is possible to do so, teachers in the institutions in which its 'external' candidates have worked. A striking example of that procedure is the 'special relationship' which existed between London and the new University Colleges in ex-British Africa in the early stages of these institutions when their students were presented for London degrees. As is right and necessary, most of these new colleges have now taken over full charge of their own standards. But they have had some useful experience. There can be no question that this important responsibility for standards is best discharged when, under suitable conventions, it belongs primarily to the teaching university. When all is said, it is that university which would suffer most from any failure in its duty.

The conclusion is, therefore, that in all these curricular matters—the determination of its educational objectives, and therefore of the content of its courses and of the standards of its awards—autonomy requires that the initiatives and major decisions should belong to the university itself, acting always not as a closed inaccessible corporation, but with the knowledge of the requirements, experience and standards of other universities, and of those institutions and agencies, statutory and private, which have a proper concern with the quality of the professional services which are staffed by university graduates.

14. *The choice of research programmes.* Questions of some complexity arise over this matter. Research in every field of knowledge, particularly in those fields of science, applied science and medicine which have a bearing on the immediate economic and social needs of the community, clearly calls for some oversight from or on behalf of

government. As with higher teaching, some authoritative body should be in a position to survey the whole range of a nation's research activity, and to ensure that every area of enquiry necessary for its safety and well-being is sufficiently explored. The universities are by no means the only research agencies. Probably the major part of applied research and development is carried out in government or industrial laboratories, or in research organizations created *ad hoc*. But the universities have a place of special significance. Their departments are responsible for the greater part of the fundamental scientific enquiry which is the mainspring of all technological progress: and a very large fraction of the workers engaged in other research establishments receive their first research experience in the universities. They are, in effect, the power-houses of the whole effort. What they do, therefore, is of the highest public importance and a matter of public concern.

Nevertheless it remains that in this matter, as in their teaching, the best results are likely to follow not from direction but from a situation in which after consultation and discussion, the universities are free to take their own final decisions on policy and programmes. There are two reasons. One is that in this context the primary (though not the sole) interest of the universities is in the enlargement of *knowledge*, in pursuing an enquiry as far as it can be taken without much regard to its practical implications. That is how fundamental scholarship and science move forward. And, as is abundantly shown by the history of invention and the experience of mankind, no one can say in advance what elements in this new knowledge will ultimately prove to be of practical importance, and what will not. There is, in fact, not very much quite useless knowledge, and the larger the fund of organized and available knowledge, the more likely is the community to find the clues to the solution of its practical problems. The second reason is that the sovereign condition of good and fruitful research is that the leaders should be men of real originality and insight. A great many people of good but not eminent quality are usefully employed in research. But their productivity depends mainly on the inspiration of the relatively few outstanding men. A high proportion—perhaps the greater part—of this not very abundant ability is to be found in the universities: and it is there because of the independence and freedom which the universities are normally able to offer. That is the condition under which these men can do their best work.

There is this further advantage—that the universities, better than anyone else, know the quality of their men, and therefore know whom to support with the facilities and resources which they need. The finance of research has at least two aspects. In most countries, it is seldom difficult to find money for investigations which may produce results likely to be capable of early economic exploitation. Industrial concerns, grant-dispensing departments of Government, Foundations and the like are ready, sometimes embarrassingly ready, to support such work. Some of these bodies are willing to support a man of proved ability, without strings or conditions of any kind. But most of such external support is, and under tax regulations often must be, directed to problems of particular interest to the supporting concerns. Funds for pure research are harder to come by. It is therefore all the more important that the university should have at its own disposal a sufficient quantum of free funds, to be expended on the men and on those open programmes of whose originality and fruitfulness they are most strongly persuaded.

The corollary is, although it is not easily accomplished, that within each university some central committee representative of the university as a whole should have knowledge and oversight of its total research undertakings. Otherwise programmes and indeed the whole structure of the university can get out of balance. Professors of repute are much in demand to act as 'consultants' to industrial firms, either in a general way or in the solution of specific problems. Money flows easily to them: their departments can become heavily involved in particular directions. Such contacts and even contracts are in every way valuable both to the departments and to industry or government, provided they are held within the limits of what can be undertaken without detriment to the general scientific activity of the department and of the university. But if that limit is overstepped, difficulties are bound to arise. In view of the many research institutions, private and governmental, with which the university has to deal, the conduct of its external relations in research is a complex and delicate business. And if there is no sympathetically exercized central oversight, the university may in time find itself either too greatly dependent on external economic interests, and therefore under the risk that its programmes may be too strongly oriented towards their requirements or faced with residual staff and financial commitments which it cannot carry without some curtailment of or injustice to its general service.

15. *Allocation of Resources.* This whole issue is, in effect, a particular case of the broader problem which has to be faced by those charged with the guidance of university policy. Every activity of the university—its undergraduate and post-graduate teaching, its research, the various forms of its extension work—involve the long-term allocation not only of recurrent income, but of capital assets—space, equipment, library services, and student facilities of all kinds. The finding of these resources and their allocation in proper balance to the purposes most likely to maintain the health and vigour of the university and its usefulness to the community, is the perpetual pre-occupation of governing bodies. No solution can be taken as fixed for all time. Scrutiny, revision, re-adjustment are necessary as knowledge expands and new requirements come into view. But a continual process of chopping and changing, of stop and go, is equally out of place. Powerful departments, able to maintain a long-term programme, are of relatively slow growth: and an assured continuity of policy is a condition of that growth. The aim, therefore, is always a carefully considered policy, founded on such foresight of new requirements as can be obtained. The universities are not without guidance in these matters, and are not unresponsive. But

if the work is to be wisely done, to the end of providing the environment and the stimulus essential to creative service, it is surely best that final decisions should be a matter for the universities themselves. Mistakes will occur. But they will be the sooner identified by a process of internal audit: and the means of remedy will be to hand. Competing points of view will there be heard: and the university's collective, autonomous decision is more likely than anything else to yield the policy which will best serve the community's needs.

16. *Consideration of the mechanisms of the relation of Government and universities.*

a) The foregoing paragraphs have analyzed the decisions which have to be taken in the ordinary course of university business. Two main conclusions seem to emerge. The universities exist to serve the society from which they draw their moral and material support. They are, therefore, properly subject to public scrutiny and criticism, and must be sensitive to the judgment of instructed and responsible opinion both as to what they aim to do, and as to the measure of their performance. On the other hand that judgment must be based on an understanding of the special kind of service which the university is intended to offer, in particular of the circumstance that while it should have regard to the actual and contemporary needs of its society, it is not restricted thereto. As well, perhaps even more, the university has to serve the long-term interest of the advancement of knowledge: and in that context it has an obligation not only to its own society, but to the whole world-wide republic of scholarship and science. It would be a poor university, and would poorly serve its time, if it were not strongly aware of its membership of this larger community, and deeply concerned to hold its place therein. And if that be rightly understood, it seems certain that no university can do its work effectively unless it is entrusted with a substantial measure of autonomy. No doubt mistakes will be made, which will call for notice by other authorities. The university should never be insulated from public interest and judgment. But given the condition, it should be left to make its own assessment of the relevance and weight of that external judgment, and, if need be, to find its own way to betterment.

b) We may then, usefully, consider the mechanisms by which that external opinion, and particularly that of Government, can enter into the university's conduct of its affairs. The main points have already been indicated in paragraph 9. One universal and critical occasion arises when at stated intervals—annually, biennially, quinquennially, as the case may be—Government has to assess the financial support which it will provide for its university system, and to decide upon the method of allocation between its different universities, and even, under some arrangements, between the different purposes for which each university seeks its support. It is common form that this process begins with the preparation by each university of a budget setting out the expenditures which it must incur to sustain its existing range of services, and the estimated cost of the further services which it wishes to provides, if the means can be found. For some of its required income, the university will look to other than governmental sources. But there will always remain a large and probably growing proportion of the total which can be found only from Government subventions. Hence, one focus of this matter of mechanism lies in the different ways by which Governments deal with this budgeting issue.

Whatever the method used, the determination of the final total expenditure on the universities must be taken by the appropriate instrument of Government itself in the light of all the commitments of different kinds for which the Government is called upon to provide. It is for governments and for governments alone to take that decision. But that matter being fixed, the detailed handling of the subvention must take broadly one of two forms. Either it will be done directly by a department of Government usually acting under a Minister, most often the Minister of Education, or it will be done by some intermediate advisory body, standing between the Minister and the universities. The former is the usual pattern where the universities are legally and explicitly State universities: the latter where the universities, whatever the measure of their financial dependence, are legally and explicitly private institutions.

Both these methods are known to work successfully: and both are known to have their occasional failures. Both require the gradual establishment of the conventions and understandings appropriate to the procedure involved. What is essential to both is that the Minister who finally presents to the Legislature (or to the competent governmental authority) the recommendation as to the total financial support to be accorded should be fully aware of the substance and justification of the universities' proposals, so that both the Legislature and the universities may be satisfied that his findings are the outcome of informed and mature consideration. The Legislature must be assured that public funds are being prudently expended. The universities, which are seldom likely to be given all that they think they can profitably use, must be assured that their whole case has been understood and weighed.

Nothing in this procedure invades the autonomy of the university. But there is one subsequent possibility which may be felt to do so. University budgets are constructed in great detail, and the final judgment as to what is to be granted is taken after similarly detailed scrutiny of its proposals and of the expenditure involved in each. As has been noted, it will frequently happen that the grant falls short of what the university seeks: and more often than not, the shortfall is due not to disapproval of what the university would wish to do, but to the circumstance that the national Treasury, in view of the totality of its commitments, cannot afford the whole desired subvention. In that situation, where the university will have to re-assess its proposals and decide upon an order of priority—it will, in fact, usually have done something of the sort in preparing its estimates—the Government may take it upon itself to decide not simply the total of the grant to be allocated, but the precise way in which the grant is to be expended. It may, therefore, happen that the government order of priorities differs from that of the universities: and the university finds itself obliged to pursue a policy other than that which it would itself have chosen.

This second detailed decision follows the proverbial logic that he who pays the piper calls the tune. And it may on occasion have the better justification that the overall government view has taken account of considerations which had not been present to the university's thinking. Nevertheless the situation could give rise to misunderstanding and difficulty. A simple 'diktat' from above, without consultation and explanation, would be at the least discouraging, and could well cause resentment.

The remedy, therefore, is that the university should be made aware of all that is in the mind of the governmental authority and afforded full opportunity to explain the basis of its own order of priorities. If the university is persuaded that the government view has substantial justification it will not be hard to find a way of giving effect to it while still retaining the measure of freedom of movement within its total budget which the university may reasonably expect. 'Line by line' accounting is always to be deprecated. It is onerous and, almost certainly, inefficient and uneconomical.

c) This consideration suggests how important it is that the contact of Government and university should be more continuous than it would be if the only occasions of meeting were over the Budget. Indeed it normally is more continuous. In the case of a State university where the Regents are appointed by the State legislature, members or representatives of the Legislature are involved in the university's budget-making process and in touch with all the considerations of policy which are expressed therein. They are therefore well-placed to strengthen the liaison between the university and the operative Department of Government, and to interpret the one to the other. A direct link of that kind can be effective. For the private State-supported universities, other methods have to be found. And it is open to question whether in any form of State-university relationship, a better method can be found than the device of a standing intermediary Committee or Commission appointed by and advisory to Government such as has been evolved in Great Britain (the University Grants Committee) and has been widely adopted not only in the older Commonwealth States, but also in some new independent States in Africa and Asia.* The usual pattern is a mixed Committee containing both lay members and some experienced practising academics, all these serving in a part-time capacity, receiving no more than a nominal remuneration, with as its Chairman, a full-time member (usually an ex-university teacher or administrator) who is a stipendiary civil servant, and who is supported by a small staff of professional civil servants. Variations are, of course, possible, though the essentials seem to be a) that the Committee should be composed of members of some eminence in academic and public affairs, who have the confidence of the responsible Minister and who command the respect of the universities, and b) a full-time Chairman and associated staff, easily and informally accessible both to the universities and to the Minister, who are free to give their full attention to the study of the national needs both in education and in research which the universities must meet, to encourage and guide the initiatives of the universities so that these needs are adequately and economically fulfilled, and in general to be in friendly touch with all the concerns of the whole university system. The Committee is, necessarily, an advisory Committee. Its chief duty is to advise the responsible Minister on matters of major policy and finance, (as, for example, the creation of new universities or the rate of expansion or contraction required in particular areas of university activity) and to advise and encourage the universities to shape their undertakings in accordance with these requirements. In actual practice, of course, in pursuance and within the limits of approved policy and finance, the Committee can make a good many executive decisions. But its power so to do is derived by delegation from the Minister: and payments made to the universities issue not from the Committee, but from the Ministry. In Britain, at least, it is a well-established convention that while the Minister (or the Government) takes the final decision as to the amount of the financial support to be voted to the university system as a whole—and on that matter his decision may differ from the advice tendered by the Committee—the Minister accepts without question the Committee's advice as to the share of the total grant to be allocated to each individual university. More than that, when the Committee intimates to a university the amount of the grant which it is to receive, the Committee also gives a clear, if informal, indication of its views of the merits of the proposals which have been put forward. It may be assumed that the university will pay very careful attention to these views. But, except on a very few points, there is no requirement that these views should be accepted. The grant is a block grant, to be expended according to the university's final judgment of its own priorities.

---

* The most recent example is in Nigeria, where a strong National Universities Commission has been appointed by the Federal Prime Minister with wide terms of reference which include "advising the Federal Government on the financial needs of university education in Nigeria, assisting in planning the balanced and co-ordinated development of the universities, receiving annually a block grant from the Federal Government and allocating it to the universities with such conditions attached as the Commission may think advisable, and making such other recommendations to the Federal Government or to universities relating to higher education as the Commission may consider to be in the national interest". The Prime Minister has also invited a distinguished British academic to act as Honorary Adviser to the Commission.

This, of course, is a complex and delicate structure which lays, particularly upon the Chairman of the Committee, a very heavy burden of work and of responsibility. His post is by far the most onerous in the whole scheme of British university administration. He must know the universities well and hold their confidence: and he must be in touch with the Minister and his principal officials, and with the whole panoply of governmental organizations, research and other, whose activities affect the activities of the universities. An unfortunate appointment to that office would make the arrangement almost unworkable. Hence, while it falls unreservedly to the Minister to appoint the Chairman, the Minister usually talks informally with some senior university officers in order to obtain their views of the acceptability of the names which are under consideration. It may fairly be said that, thus far, over fifty years, some of them years of great stress and difficulty, this system in Britain has worked with remarkable success. It has achieved a great expansion and redeployment of the university system, not without pressure and persuasion, but in the end with the willing co-operation of the universities and with no impairment of their ultimate right to decide their own policies or, except briefly, of their relations with Government.

17. This essay, founded in the main on a long experience of the British universities where the tradition of autonomy is strong, has become, perhaps inevitably, something of an apologia for that tradition, even of a plea for its maintenance in these newer states which are still in the early stages of building their university systems. I hope, however, that it makes full recognition of the principle that the duty of the universities is to serve the public interest, rightly conceived: that their claim to a high degree of autonomy rests not on privilege, but on the teaching of experience: that only under that condition can they give the full measure of their service: and that they have no title to be exempt from public interest, judgment and criticism—on the contrary, that they use their freedom best when, under the stimulus of such judgment, they hold their policies under frequent review. It follows, therefore, that Government, in deciding upon the measure of support to be accorded to the universities, has the duty to inform itself of their objectives and of the measure of their achievement, and as well to disclose to them its view of the current needs in education and in research which in the national interest should be met: and that, to that end, it is essential to establish agencies of easy, informal, continuous communication and consultation, so that decisions need not be taken in an atmosphere of misunderstanding and crisis.

The essence of the matter is that a good university is not simply an aggregate of separate functional agencies, but a society in which all its different elements are held together in and inspired by the experienced unity of a single dominant intellectual end, whose health therefore lies in the freest possible interplay of all its personalities and disciplines. Not all university teachers can rise to the height of this commission. Yet most of them make some approach to it: and some can match its call. When that happens, the influence of a man of stature is never restricted to his own department. It spills over into the life of the whole community: and others besides his immediate students and colleagues bear his imprint. But neither the average nor the eminent can make their contribution unless they are free to follow their thinking wherever it may lead, and are sustained by a society which itself is nourished in freedom.

The implication is that the university should be careful not only of its corporate autonomy, but of the academic freedom of its members. Such a claim as this, however, is not to be made without full acknowledgment of the obligation which it involves. It is a claim that the university teacher is free, when he is led to do so, to set himself against received opinion. If he does so within the area of his own scientific or scholarly work, he may expect opposition and criticism, against which he must, with all the evidence he can bring to bear, try to establish his own view. In those areas, a good case will in time make its way. But in most of those areas also, controversy, if such there be, is likely to be limited to the circle of the experts: and only rarely, as in the famous encounter between the Darwinian biologists and the theologians, does it excite much popular interest or antipathy. Even so, the proponent of a heterodox view takes, as it were, his professional life in his hands. If he succeeds, he is safe for at least some limited renown. If he fails, his reputation declines and his prospects of larger academic opportunity may well be diminished. But no question either of public emotion or of university autonomy is likely to arise in this context. The issue is settled, rightly or wrongly, by the preponderant opinion in Academe itself.

But there are some cases of a different kind, where an academic may come to hold and to declare opinions on matters of wide public interest and importance, touching, even adversely, the policy of the government from which his university draws its support. His opinions may arise from his professional studies, if, for example, he is a social scientist, or they may arise from his point of view as a citizen on the affairs of his society. That situation is far from unknown in well-established and mature societies in the English-speaking world and elsewhere, and has there at times caused bitter controversy. It has been repeated recently in some of the new universities and colleges of Africa. In paragraph 11 g), I have already said something on this point. I do not know that there is any universally applicable rule. No one can doubt that public order is a fundamental interest of all societies, and that if any citizen is led to recommend actions which contravene the requirements of public order as defined, whether wisely or unwisely, in publicly promulgated statutes, he must expect that Government will act to protect itself against him. And he has no real complaint if it does so. He has chosen, perhaps rightly—since this may be the only way by which he can witness to his convictions—to act against the government: and the sincerity and effectiveness of his protest can be measured by his willingness to accept its consequences. The State, as well as the Church, has need of its martyrs. All this may be tragic. The government may be acting imprudently in driving a sincere man into overt opposition. But so long as it acts within the authorization of its published law, the academic is in the same position as any other dissenting citizen. The university may well testify to his sincerity and competence, may even, at risk of incurring the same penalty, support the rightness of his action. But it cannot, as such, protect him, since what is at issue here is not the freedom of the university, but the freedom of the citizen.

The situation, however, is quite different when the government seeks to impose upon the university the duty of exacting from its members a pledge of general orthodoxy either of scientific or of political opinion, and to proceed against those who in the judgment of the government offend against this canon. That is a clear offence against university autonomy: and the university, both in its own interest and in the broader interest of maintaining the conditions of free teaching and free learning, does well to resist. That is not to say that the university has no concern with what its members do and say. It has ground for complaint if in the course of his class teaching, a member goes out of his way to promulgate ideas which have nothing to do with the matter under consideration. It may properly use its own methods and sanctions to deal with this situation. Even there, the case may be far from clear, since part of the business of a good teacher is to be concerned with the relations of his own subject to other areas of intellectual enquiry, and he may properly seek to show the wider interest and relevance of his specialist conclusions. The last thing a university wants is stolid, text-book, unimaginative teaching.

This, therefore, is proper matter for the university: and it is not likely to be indifferent to it. But it remains that the university teacher himself has his own obligation. He is, like others, a citizen: and, as has been noted, there may be times when his citizen duty, as he sees it, may at any cost be paramount. But he is a citizen with a special responsibility. He is, or ought to be, one of the intellectual leaders of the community, and therefore, more than others, charged with the duty of taking account of all the factors in the situation in which he acts. He must expect that his words and example will carry peculiar weight. He has in trust the stability of the university itself, and its varied contribution to the advancement of many branches of knowledge and to the educational and social welfare of its community. There is virtue in the willingness to recognize the facts of an existing situation and the limits of the development of which it is immediately capable. In no historic civilization has freedom been an early growth. In all its manifestations it needs the background of a measure of political stability and economic security. All these things are to be weighed: and a university teacher has no right lightly to involve his university in controversy. Yet it will happen that, even under the most conscientious scutiny, different men will reach different conclusions as to the line of their duty and each must take his own course. It would be idle to ask that, especially on issues in which moral judgments are involved, scholars and scientists should be emotionally neutral. Emotional engagement is for them, as for others, a condition of effective action. But they can be asked always to have in mind that their primary service is to give light rather than heat, so that however firm their statements, they should be temperate and fair. That is the scientific attitude. Where it is maintained, tension will be held to a minimum, and intractable situations will seldom arise. And on all sides it has to be remembered that a deep sense on the part of all members of their personal responsibility for and towards the community is the sovereign condition of the autonomy of the university, as ultimately that same sense widely spread throughout the body politic is the condition of the freedom of the society which the university serves.

APPENDIX

ON STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

This paper has considered only the decisions which the Governing Bodies of the university have to take in the course of their administration. There is, however, a claim to 'autonomy' or to a substantial measure of autonomy, from another element in the university—the undergraduate body. It may be pertinent to add a short note on that matter.

This is a claim not as against the State or any other external authority, but as against or within the university of which the claimants are junior or apprentice members. Within a limited area of interest, the claim is entirely proper, and is usually conceded. To manage their own societies, publications, athletics, Students' Unions, and the various services (book-exchanges, travel facilities and the like) which students are accustomed to provide for themselves is to them a valuable educational experience and part of their preparation for adult life. They make lots of mistakes. But they are called to account by their contemporaries who suffer from their errors and that is part of the process. It is also entirely proper that there should exist an official student organization—a representative Council or the like—which is authorized to bring to the notice of the Governing Bodies its views upon any matter touching the general welfare and progress of the students, or the interests of individual students who may feel themselves aggrieved or injured by any action of the university. All this, I think, is common form. And in some countries (*e.g.* in Scandinavia) student organizations carry a large financial and administrative responsibility for the housing and feeding of students. They conduct—so far as I have seen very successfully—large business enterprises to that end. This latter more extended activity is more practicable where, as in Scandinavia, a substantial fraction of the student-body spend only part of their time on their university courses and part on earning. There is therefore a reserve of experienced senior students or young graduates who can take charge of these enterprises and are paid for their service. This, I believe, is what generally happens. Very few quite young students are involved.

Difficulties, however, arise when, as in some countries, the claim of the student-body is that they should participate a) in the general government of the university, and particularly b) in determining the content of their courses of instruction and the standard of the examinations which they are required to pass. b) is quite certainly dangerous, except in the form which normally operates, *i.e.* in the broad right of a Representative Council to make to the Governing Bodies observations on any matter affecting student interests. Students have none of the experience required to make a balanced judgment on academic issues of this kind; and if this claim were ever seriously conceded, its tendency would certainly be towards a lowering of standards. And, over a large area of university business a) is equally impossible. Much of that business, like the appointment of staff or the allocation of available resources, calls both for experience and for a high degree of confidentiality—neither of which conditions can be met by undergraduates. Nevertheless, it is possible and desirable to associate representative students with the discussion of certain items of business in which they have a special concern—as, for example, the management of the health and welfare services provided by the university, and the planning of any buildings, like common-rooms, refectories, gymnasia and theatres, designed particularly for their use. On committees charged with the oversight of such matters undergraduates can be serviceable and satisfactory members. It is useful also to hold regular conferences, two or three in each academic year, between representatives of the students and of the Governing Bodies, at which both parties can raise informally and freely any questions which they have in mind. Such meetings can be mutually enlightening, and the knowledge that they are being held, and that the Governing Bodies are attentive to student experience and opinion tends to allay any smouldering discontent. A safety-valve is always a useful device.

These procedures are in use at all the British universities—and I have no doubt elsewhere. And perhaps they furnish part of the explanation of the curious phenomenon that in the one group of the British universities where the undergraduates have the right of representation on the principal Governing Body, they use it in a way which makes it, from the point of view of their own special interests, of almost no effect. In the four Scottish universities the undergraduates elect, every three years, an officer who is not only a member of the University Court, but its Chairman. They are perfectly free to elect one of themselves, or anybody else who has close acquaintance with their affairs. In practice, they never do—usually preferring to elect some eminent personage in public life, resident, as a rule, in London, who knows nothing about their doings and wishes, and whose participation in university business is merely nominal.

All this is comparatively simple. But it would be a mistake not to recognize that in various ways, there is some potential danger in the student situation. In most countries, the student population is growing rapidly in numbers. It is easily excited and organized and is increasingly practised in the art of making contact with Government. Students, everywhere, have come to look to Government to provide them with financial support, and to assure them of such other conditions of life and work as they regard as satisfactory. In Britain certainly and probably elsewhere, student organizations are active propagandists on behalf of their own interests: and since they are already a considerable and prospectively influential fraction of the electorate, politicians of all colours are apt to listen to what they have to say. They have found it easy to have their concerns ventilated in Parliament, and have unquestionably had some effect on governmental policy in the matter of student support.

They have therefore acquired the habit of appeal to the political authority and of quasi-political action. (Indeed in Britain, the same is true of younger members of university staffs who have energetically and successfully sought to mobilize Parliamentary opinion in favour of higher university stipends). Thus far, as regards their relations to their universities, students in Britain have restricted their recourse to political authority to the subject of their own material conditions. But habit grows with use, and there is nothing in the situation to guarantee that this limit will always be observed. Any well organized group of students, displeased by some act of university policy, will have little difficulty in raising enough trouble in Parliament to cause Ministerial enquiry and even, conceivably, Government intervention.

I see no way of avoiding this possibility. It is inherent in the university situation. But it makes clear, if any reminder were needed, how desirable it is that every university should maintain open and easy communications between the representatives of the undergraduates and its Governing Bodies.

COMMENTS
BY MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

Translated from the French.

BELGIUM

Dr. J. BAUGNIET

Honorary President of the Association
Honorary Rector, University of Brussels

The structure of higher education in Belgium comprises two types of university. State universities (Ghent and Liège) and free or private universities (Brussels and Louvain).

Whereas the free universities enjoy the fullest autonomy, apart from certain restrictions which will be mentioned later, the State universities have long had none, and it was only the law of 28 April, 1953 which allowed them a few privileges, and still strictly limited ones.

The administration of the State universities is shared between the Rector and the Academic Council in academic matters on the one hand, and the Administrative Council chaired by the Rector and the Vice-President of the Administrative Council on the other.

The Academic Council discusses all questions concerning the university and higher education, and concerning any proposed establishment of faculties, institutes, schools or inter-faculty centres; it also makes proposals for the appointment of certain members of staff.

The administration of the free universities is carried out by a sovereign Administrative Council in accordance with the constitution they define for themselves. For the Catholic University of Louvain, this Administrative Council is composed of the bishops of Belgium, assisted by a General Council comprising, apart from the Rector Magnificus, the Rector, the Pro-Rectors and Vice-Rectors, members of the academic staff, and some outside individuals.

For the Free University of Brussels, this Administrative Council comprises, apart from the Rector, two former Rectors, the Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the faculties, and permanent members chosen in equal numbers from the academic staff and from outside individuals, either from the business world, or holding important responsibilities in political life.

The President of the Council is chosen by the Council itself from among its members; sometimes he belongs to the academic staff, but has often been chosen from among the permanent members of the Council who do not form part of the academic staff. The Rector is elected by the General Assembly of ordinary professors from among their number.

Side by side with the Administrative Council is an Academic Council chaired by the Rector, and comprising former Rectors, the Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the faculties.

The Academic Council deals with questions concerning higher education, and suggests improvements which it feels should be made in the curricula or in the academic organization of study. Its decisions are submitted for the approval of the Administrative Council, which must ratify them.

1. *Choice and Method of Appointment of the Professional Staff of the University: teachers, research workers and administrators.*

While the free universities have every right to choose their own academic staff, research workers and administrators, this is by no means the case for the State universities.

The Administrative Council of these latter have in fact only the right to *advise*, following discussion by the faculties, on the nomination of *chargés de cours, professeurs extraordinaires* and *professeurs ordinaires*.

The Council submits proposals for the selection of *agrégés, répétiteurs*, and professional academic staff, particularly *chefs de travaux* and *conservateurs*, in agreement with the faculties, schools, institutes or inter-faculty centres concerned.

It also makes proposals for the selection of the head librarian, in agreement with the Academic Council and of other librarians.

The power of appointment of these members of staff lies with the King (through the Ministry of Education); the Administrative Council has the power of appointment only of the other members of the academic staff (*assistants, élèves-assistants* et *internes de clinique*, and of the administrative staff below the rank of *chef de bureau*, together with special technical and auxiliary staff).

It should, however, be emphasized that the King usually accepts the advice and suggestions of the Administrative Council.

2. *Selection of Students at Various Levels.*

Admission to the universities is controlled by law for entrance to the various faculties; it is necessary to hold the secondary school certificate delivered by the head of secondary institutions, and examined by a jury constituted by royal decree, which verifies that the legally-required conditions have been fulfilled. If the candidate does not hold a certificate accepted by the jury, he must show that he has taken a preparatory test, before a State jury, the conditions of which are determined by law. Admission to the faculties of applied sciences is always subject to a preparatory test before a jury constituted by the faculty in which the candidate will work.

These conditions are obligatory for all students who hope to obtain a "Legal" degree, that is to say an academic qualification which will enable the holder to practise one of the professions controlled by law (teaching, the Bar, the magistrature, the notarial profession, medicine, pharmacy, public administration).

Side by side with the "legal" qualifications, the universities can award "academic" ones which from the point of view of knowledge are of equal standing with the "legal" degrees, but which do not entitle their holders to practise the professions open to the holders of "legal" ones.

The universities can also award "academic" degrees in all fields.

For students who wish to obtain an "academic" degree, the universities determine their own admission procedures. The requirements for the State universities are determined by royal decree; for the free universities, by their sovereign organs.

A bill, drawn up the *Conseil national de la politique scientifique*, has been tabled by the Ministry of Education in an endeavour to bring to an end this peculiarly Belgian distinction between "legal" and "academic" degrees—a distinction which no longer appears justified.

Once the student is admitted to a university, selection is made year by year by examining juries composed in both State and free universities of the professors and lecturers who have taught the subjects being examined.

3. *Structure of the Curricula Offered to the Students and Definition of the Standards and Levels required for the Granting of Degrees and Diplomas.*

In both State and free universities, the programme of work leading to "legal" degrees (see above, para 2) is established by the laws concerning the award of academic degrees and the university examination programmes.

For "academic" degrees, the programme for the State universities is determined by the King (through the Ministry of Education) following advice from the universities. For the free universities their own organs can determine freely the conditions for the granting of the "academic" degrees they establish, the curricula for which they themselves determine.

The proposed law mentioned above in para 2 is designed to put an end to this groundless differentiation between "legal" and "academic" degrees.

4. *Choice of Research Programmes.*

In both the State and the free universities, the choice of research programmes is freely made by the professors within the limits of their budgetary allocations.

Since university budgets are inadequate for the establishment of research programmes requiring expenditure in excess of that normally provided for in the budget (the proportion of university expenditure devoted to research is apparently about one third of the budget), outside help has to be sought. A large proportion of this help is provided by the State, in the form of grants made to the bodies which are required to distribute funds for the programmes presented by the research workers. (*Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique* (F.N.R.S.); *Fonds National de la Recherche Fondamentale Collective* (F.N.R.F.C.); *Institut pour l'encouragement de la Recherche Scientifique dans l'Industrie et l'Agriculture* (I.R.S.I.A.); *Fonds de la Recherche scientifique médicale*, etc.).

The intervention of these bodies, which do not determine the choice of the research for which help is requested, is increasingly being co-ordinated through the *Conseil national de la politique scientifique*, which is charged by the Government with the definition of research programmes.

Research workers also find help for themselves, either on their own initiative or on that of their university, from private bodies (industrial or individual donors), though this procedure occasionally leads to some direction of the choice of study.

5. *Determination of the Arrangements necessary for Teaching or Research and the Allocation of Resources.*

In the State universities, these questions are dealt with in a budget prepared by the Ministry of Education, at the suggestion of the universities, and included in the State budget submitted for the approval of the legislative chambers.

In the free universities, the Administrative Council holds the entire responsibility for the preparation of the draft budget and therefore for the determination of the arrangements necessary for teaching and research, and the allocation of resources.

Although the free universities receive from the State a considerable proportion of the resources necessary for the establishment of their budget, the Government exercizes no control over the use of the grants. The universities are required simply to submit their budgets and their accounts each year to the Government. The Government does not attempt to influence these, and has confidence in the free universities. The law fixes the subventions of the free universities at a proportion of the annual allocation made in the State's budget for its own universities.

The free universities are required not to allow their teaching, academic or administrative staff salaries and allowances in excess of those of the staff of the State universities.

This is the only restriction which this law imposes on the autonomy of the free universities.

The State universities have for many years claimed the right to an equally far-reaching autonomy. The law of 28 April, 1953 was but a small step in this direction.

6. *Student Participation in University Government.*

It seems to me that excessive student participation in the government of universities may jeopardize university autonomy. I do not consider it wise, in particular, that students should share responsibility for the determination of curricula, the appointment of teachers or the financial management of their institutions.

Whereas it is perfectly legitimate that students should be concerned with the administration of a number of services specifically established for their benefit such as hostels, restaurants, welfare and preventive medical services, sporting activities, etc... it does not seem to me well-advised to go further. Students can constitute a pressure group as dangerous to the university as any other.

Translated from the French.

DENMARK

Dr. A. Blinkenberg*

Former Rector, University of Aarhus

I. The Present Situation

1. *Finance.*

Despite certain differences, mostly in matters of form in the statutes by which they are governed, the two Danish universities, as well as the other institutions of higher education of university standing (Polytechnical, Pharmaceutical, Veterinary Schools, etc.),** are directly dependent on the state for almost the whole of their income.

There are no tuition fees; and therefore no revenue arises in this way.

Some endowments still exist and there are occasionally new donations, the last manifestations of private benefactions apparently disappearing. Income from these endowments remains outside the annual credits allocated by the state, but their rôle is now a minimum one. Where they do exist, they can, of course, introduce a little administrative flexibility which is lacking within a budget where the use of allocations is strictly divided into different chapters and articles and where transfer from one to another is not permitted.

Except for the financing of some of the research carried out in university institutes, the essential elements of financial administration are based on the subventions directly provided by the state.

Each university retains the initiative in establishing its budget. Budgetary estimates are then presented by the university to the Ministry of Education. They are accompanied by an order of priority for the increased credits requested. An oral discussion of them then takes place during which the university may explain in detail its preferences with regard to reductions when these are enforced; and these preferences are mostly taken into account. Final decisions, however, remain with the two Ministries of Education and Finance and above these with the Government and Parliament.

---

* Dr. Blinkenberg served as a full member of the Board during the period in which Dr. Merikoski was in office as Foreign Minister of Finland.

** In what follows "universities", refers to all institutions of university status.

44/

Financial control of the universities by the state is therefore at the basis of the entire system, but in general it takes the form of a continuing collaboration where normally the interests of the two parties tend to mingle with each other and to be subordinate to the needs of the collectivity. It is clear, however, that differences can exist in the estimation of these needs and that these can be differently seen by those who have a political responsibility before the country and those who represent a long university tradition.

2. *Appointment of Teaching and Other Staff.*

University teachers are elected by the relevant faculties on the proposal of expert committees chosen by these same faculties. Appointment is made by the Government, but no instance exists where the opinion of the faculty has not been respected. On this essential question, university autonomy may be considered as fully guaranteed.

The appointment of junior staff is left entirely to the universities.

With regard to administrative functions, rectors and deans, as well as members of university councils (called "consistories" in the Universities of Copenhagen and Aarhus) are elected by their peers with no possibility of ministerial intervention.

At the University of Copenhagen, financial administration is placed under the authority of a "questor" appointed by the Ministry of Education. This is the only case in our university system where a special official exclusively concerned with the financial administration of the university depends directly on the Ministry. He normally exercizes his financial control, however, in accordance with decisions of the "consistory" or rector. Above all, no interference in university work may be exercized by him on his own initiative, nor arise from orders given him by the Ministry.

3. *Selection of Students.*

In Denmark, access to higher education is in principle open to everyone holding his baccalaureat certificate. A "numerus clausus" may, however, intervene in particular situations, but only for imperative reasons (lack of space, etc.). Apart from urgency measures, it may be said that in general no university autonomy exists in admitting students; on the contrary student autonomy exists with regard to the entry into university studies. The universities therefore are obliged to organize their teaching in relation to the standards of those who qualify at the end of their secondary studies.

4. *Curricular Programmes and Examinations.*

For those parts of university teaching which are designed to prepare students for public service or entry into the liberal professions, it is natural that constant collaboration should exist between universities and public authorities.

The curricular programmes, as well as the level of intermediate examinations and final examinations, are fixed by law and ministerial decrees. The universities play an important part in fixing these regulations, a rôle which is a preponderant one with regard to details, a little less so sometimes in the general determination of the duration of various studies.

The establishing of new branches of study almost always arises through university initiative. Following a first discussion within the faculty concerned, the new creation in question, in the form of a request for finance, is conveyed to the Ministry which must give its approval. It is evident that in this question of the creation of new branches of teaching, as well as in that of creation of new chairs within already existing programmes, the intervention of the authorities in the establishing of curricular programmes is necessarily felt, and sometimes very strongly. With this admitted, however, it must be emphasized that the intervention of the public authorities normally consists of a brake on expenditure, the State thus keeping a purely financial rôle as a fund provider.

5. *Research.*

University activity in the field of research, pure or applied, is entirely a university responsibility, both in the choice of programmes and their execution and, within them, of each of their members responsible for a section or of the heads of research institutes, their freedom being limited only by the credits available to them.

If available credits are increased for a particular field of research (for example studies in carcinology, studies on the ionosphere) through subventions provided either by a private foundation or by industry, the universities and their research institutes may accept conditions placed on the utilization of these extra-budgetary subventions, on condition that their freedom remains complete in the dissemination of their results—as is necessary for the progress of knowledge, itself the true purpose of university research.

On this point, university autonomy is complete and beyond discussion, within the limits established for credits and staff.

II. Remarks on some Essential Problems of the Present Situation

One of the principal aspects of the situation in Denmark with regard to the problem of university autonomy emerges with a certain clarity in the brief history of the youngest of our two present complete universities, the University of Aarhus.

It was founded in 1928, after more than seventy-five years of discussion of the need for a second university. At first conceived as a free university with its own character, of open access, and devoted above all to general studies not necessarily leading to specific careers, it took a precise form only in the discussions at the beginning of this century, at the moment when the increase in the number of students was causing a considerable over-crowding in certain faculties of the ancient University of Copenhagen. The need for a new university was then keenly felt in a group of university people in Copenhagen, itself rather a small one at the beginning; the efforts of this group were based from the start on an idea widespread throughout the country that the concentration of our higher education was excessive, and that all the institutions connected with it were in a single city of the country—the capital.

A commission was appointed by the Government to study the problems of creating a new university in the provinces. This commission agreed to recommend the creation of a state university at Aarhus.

For more than ten years nothing further was done. It needed local initiative, the united forces of the middle classes and the municipality of Aarhus to produce the embryo of a university in 1928, an institution autonomous by its statutes and basing itself financially on private donations and above all on municipal credits, with no financial participation from the State. Following rapid developments which have led to a complex of five faculties, with more than 4,000 students, the University of Aarhus still remains autonomous by statute; but today 99% of its income is provided by the State, and in reality the second university, with merely formal modifications, functions exactly like the ancient state University of Copenhagen.

Preparations are actively being made today for the creation of a third university, and later on of a fourth and fifth one. No opposition is raised to the idea that these should be state universities, and it must be foreseen that the autonomous University of Aarhus will itself soon be transformed into a state university. Ten years ago, the Professors' Council of the University of Aarhus had a clear majority in favour of an autonomous constitution. This majority has fallen as the active interest of the middle classes and that of the municipality have diminished. The different councils and administrative posts which bear witness to its local origin have today lost almost entirely any real content, and everyone feels that the phase of formal autonomy is definitely over.

Those who took an active part in the administration of the University of Aarhus in this first phase, and who were able to follow closely the evolution leading from early autonomy towards definite governmental status, have been able to observe that real autonomy is just as well guaranteed—and sometimes better—when the university depends on the State, as when local authorities or personalities are involved who may be tempted to interfere more directly in the conduct of its affairs than our liberal Government usually does.

If I have written at length about this evolution of a young university, it is because in my opinion the proof is already demonstrated in our country that there is little to expect in our present society from the participation of "laymen" (in the English sense of this word) or of municipalities. The proof is equally clear that State control of the universities does not express itself as a diminution of university autonomy; on all essential points this autonomy may exist within an administration which is financially controlled by the State.

Clearly this general agreement about the present need for the State administration of universities in no way excludes certain difficulties and even certain dangers for autonomy which arise from this system. The remarks which follow will try to make clear that on certain points there is an undesirable risk of interference.

It emerges from what I said at the beginning of this essay on the present situation that a part of this complex of conditions, included according to Sir Hector Hetherington in the term autonomy, finds itself completely outside discussion in the present Danish university situation.

This is true above all for the central feature of the system: the appointment of professors. In our procedure, fixed by strict rules strictly observed, two decisive factors come into play: first of all the opinion of the expert committee and, secondly, in a full meeting of the faculty concerned, the majority decision of the members of the faculty.*

The Committee of Experts is normally composed of three to five members; professors from other universities, including some from other Scandinavian countries, help to ensure the academic level of the discussions and the proposals of the committee, in those cases where the faculty concerned does not itself have a sufficient number of specialists in the discipline in question. These extra university members count as part of the faculty in question during the discussion which precedes the decision and in the vote which ends it. Before the meeting of the faculty, candidates for the vacant chair are informed of the overall opinion of the committee, and have the right to put their own observations before the faculty before the formal discussion takes place. The faculty vote which is taken immediately after this discussion is final, and the Government is involved only for the formalities of the appointment.

Another sector in which the situation concerning autonomy is satisfactory is that concerned with the independence of research carried out in the universities, and in the research institutes attached to them. No outside interference arises in the direction of this research. The independence of the university and of the professors individually is admitted by everybody.

Mention must be made, however, of two restrictions on the free functioning of this activity. The first concerns the scale of financial resources placed at the universities' disposal by the State, which here exercizes its normal function as a controller of expenditure. It is not surprising that the institutes often feel circumscribed in their normal budgets. Happily the existence in Denmark of important scientific foundations in many cases usefully lightens the effect of momentary or prolonged governmental deficiencies. The distribution of subventions from these foundations is carried out by highly-qualified scientists and scholars; they play a rôle of the highest importance in our academic life.

---

* Exceptionally the faculty may dispense with the Committee of Experts procedure in order to proceed immediately to the election of a particularly well qualified scholar to a vacant chair.

On the contrary, in certain cases where the choice between candidates is difficult, the first normally constituted Committee of Experts may be transformed into a large committee which, if need be, can order a competition among all candidates, or a fixed number of them.

The second restriction on the progress of research carried out in the universities is due not to direct interference but to a rivality between the disinterested research done in universities and the more utilitarian type carried out by industrial organizations, which normally are rather reluctant to make the results of the scientific work carried out in their laboratories public. These powerful economic firms can offer more important financial advantages to scientists than universities in order to obtain their services, in this way reducing the free and unrestricted work of these same scientists. It seems to me, however, that the danger represented by the double occupations is fairly limited in the present situation.

There is greater danger in the very real rivality which exists between the two sectors of research in recruiting the élite of young scientists who have to choose a career. At a moment at which there is a shortage of young graduates because of the explosive development of the number and importance of all kinds of scientific laboratories, the competition between the university sector, where salaries are restricted, and that of the industrial and commercial world, where salaries are arranged by negotiation, constitutes a grave danger for the functioning of the university sector.

Even in the Humanities, there is a rivality at present, less with the private sector than with that of the State itself as the organizer of secondary education, a qualified young person being able to obtain a far more advantageous financial status there than that of a young assistant or lecturer in a university.

In the first part of this paper I underlined the special situation created for our universities by their obligation to admit all the students who have the "baccalaureat".

Here we are at the other end of the ladder, university autonomy being almost totally non-existent in this sector.

It is true that the universities have always been able to express their point of view when changes are made in the organization of secondary studies, but their opinions carry little weight and do not greatly influence governmental decisions. The time has gone when the "baccalaureat" was chiefly considered as a preparation for university study. It is considered now as the terminating examination of general studies, which are broadly orientated towards many different careers.

There is a danger at present of a lowering of the standards of study, following successive changes in the "baccalaureat", and many university people are alarmed about this to such a degree that the idea has frequently been put forward that the universities should take the initiative of creating a compulsory entrance examination for university studies; this examination would give the universities a real autonomy with regard to admission.

Such a project could not be carried out without a major political debate and a great upheaval in public opinion. The chances of achieving it are perhaps not very good. It must also be admitted, I believe, that the number of examinations to be undergone is already sufficiently large, and that the main effort towards improvement should not be in the direction of creating new barriers against the afflux of students but, on the contrary, towards the possibility of widening such access by facilitating the transfer from secondary education to higher education, on the understanding that the university will be able to eliminate the inadequately-qualified surplus by eliminating tests, taking place at a later stage and more precise than those which could be held at the time of admission.

These moderate views seem to be predominant in the Danish university world at present. The latest reform of primary and secondary education is only just beginning to bring results. In any case it would thus be premature to form an opinion at the present time, whatever apprehensions may be felt with regard to a reform concerned with something quite different from the difficult problems of transfer from secondary education to university studies.

I must add a word about the intermediate area between that where autonomy is satisfactorily realized, and the one I have just mentioned where it does not exist.

The problems which exist between these two extremes and which today are of the utmost topicality are those concerned first, with the method of financing university budgets, then those of the duration of studies, itself a function of established curricular programmes and, finally, a general planning of higher studies and a closer co-ordination between the different universities and other institutions of the same level, including the different research institutes whose number is increasing.

With regard to financial problems, it would be desirable to introduce a greater flexibility in the use of the sums placed annually at the disposal of the universities.

An important improvement could be made in our university administration by the adoption of the English system of quinquennial grants. Such an innovation would be in direct conflict with our present parliamentary practice; it should be noted, however, that a highly qualified voice has recently been heard in our parliamentary circles recommending this procedure. If such a reform cannot be achieved rapidly, attention should at least be given to the elaboration of a new, less revolutionary, practice by which responsible administrators should be allowed to carry over into a later year budgetary credits which have not been used during the year for which they were granted, a simple method of financial administration which unfortunately is lacking in our present practice.

To obtain greater administrative flexibility it would also be necessary to increase considerably the small sums which hitherto have been placed at the disposal of universities without precise ear-marking.

With regard to curricular programmes and the duration of studies, there is wide anxiety at present, especially in industrial circles, but also elsewhere and tending to appear in political circles too, because of the inadequate numbers of those who come out of the universities and other institutions of higher education with fully completed training. Because of this, the government has asked the universities to consider a revision of curricular programmes so that the normal duration of studies might be shortened.

Certain professional organizations are beginning to be actively interested in these questions, and are at present asking to be consulted about curricular changes in the faculties preparing for the careers with which they are concerned.*

One part of public opinion is suggesting, for various branches of study, a differentiation between certain curricular programmes allowing for two different levels of final qualification, the higher one corresponding to the present level, and the lower one to a more practical training leading more rapidly to a diploma and entry into practical life. A differentiation of this kind already exists in technological studies.

The universities would be extremely anxious if there were a wider development of these tendencies, since it seems to them to threaten the very essence of university teaching, which above all should be theoretical and critical.

It is to be feared that the participation of professional organizations in the establishment of curricular programmes would emphasize utilitarian and sectional considerations too much in future discussions about these programmes.

Continual re-adaptation in a rapidly evolving university situation is a clear necessity today. This evolution constantly requires the enlargement of present institutions or the creation of new ones, and therefore involves a whole series of problems, among which are those of good geographical distribution of universities and a regularization of the relationships between similar institutions.

The general planning of higher studies which arises in this situation almost necessarily involves the creation of a new organ, at a higher level than that of particular institutions about which I have so far spoken.

It goes without saying that such an organ could hardly function without diminishing in one way or another the autonomy of those particular institutions which the co-ordinating organ would have to incorporate in a general plan.

The Government is directly interested in a better organization of planning. To whoever casts even a cursory glance at the funds provided by the State for the universities, and the continual and more and more rapid increase in these funds, it is clear that the Government must scrupulously examine the administration of the means put at the disposal of the universities, and that it must be particularly anxious about the risk of duplicating expenditures.

---

* Much in the same way as the professional organizations, the student organizations, which in each university elect a student council in which the different branches of study are represented, are interested in these questions. These councils have consultative status with regard to questions touching particularly on student problems.

It is therefore not surprising that a committee of university administrators is at present sitting, in order to form an opinion about the problems involved in new planification.

To the extent that the State rightly wishes to continue a good and old tradition, and to avoid as much as possible any direct interference in the decisions which determine the work of university institutions, it is natural that one of the two following solutions should be considered:

1. The creation of a high post whose holder would be independent both of the Government and of the universities, appointed by the Government on the proposal of the institutions concerned and guaranteed a long period of office—that is to say a "Chancellor" of the universities,* advising both the universities and the Government, and at the same time a critic and planner and, above all, a mediator between conflicting interests.

Such a high post would be a difficult one, and the choice of a Chancellor is full of risks, since he will determine what happens for long periods.

This is doubtless why a second possibility is envisaged, namely:

2. The creation of a "council of universities and scientific research" which would have functions similar to those sketched for a possible Chancellor, but which would have the advantage of representing all the institutions and authorities directly concerned in uninterrupted consultation, not only on details but also on the essential problems of all university activities.

The following problems come to mind by way of example:

Concentration or decentralization (creation of new universities and faculties, or the development of those already existing);

The balance to be maintained between the major branches of knowledge (human sciences—natural sciences);

The balance to be maintained between respect for the autonomy of the various universities and the sacrifices demanded by respect for the common good.

I personally believe that the creation of such a "council of universities and research", which has well-known parallels in other countries, would clarify many problems and smooth out many difficulties.

By making this new council a strictly consultative body, every suspicion of control could be avoided, since the minority opinions and even those of individual members of the council should always accompany majority opinions, at the moment when the council, at the request of the Government, would be asked to express its views.

---

* Sweden already has a post of the kind sketched here.

Such a limitation of the powers of the new council would create from the beginning an atmosphere of confidence in this novelty introduced into our university life. It cannot be denied that university circles remain very cautious in their attitude to these projects. The reason for this certainly lies in their wish to safeguard university autonomy as it has long existed; for initiative and responsibility for university and scientific planning has hitherto—at least in essential matters—remained in the hands of the professors' councils of each institution and their elected representatives.

Those who have long experience of the inner life of universities know how important it is to maintain as far as possible a unity of spirit and action in each university, and its own particularities within the general framework of the institutions of higher education of the country. A most valuable fervour results from this, for a truly universal outlook is often more at ease in a local framework than in a national framework—a paradoxical truth which must never be lost from sight in the problems with which we are concerned.

The university situation set out in the preceding pages corresponds to the present tendencies occurring very generally throughout the country, which, while retaining a liberal economic system, is seeing a gradual evolution of different sectors of the national life (including that of education in general) towards administrative forms coloured by modified Socialism, where the central administration, above all, is continually growing in power.

The problem of university autonomy as it presents itself today in Denmark therefore accurately reflects the general situation of the country, which is equally that of other countries near or distant.

In trying to generalize a little about our experience, it is perhaps permissible for me to draw the following conclusions. If by university autonomy one means complete independence, legally and financially guaranteed, making the university as it were a power apart in society, it is certain that such a life apart can no longer be maintained on its former basis in a society rapidly evolving towards a greater administrative concentration and a greater economic egalitarianism—in the conditions of modern science within which the rapid growth of knowledge, and more and more advanced specialization, are continually requiring larger financial allocations.

The first of these factors forbids the old isolated life of universities; and the second requires a constant appeal for funds which puts the university at the mercy of the state, the sole provider possible in a country where large fortunes are disappearing.

It is necessary, therefore, that those who guide the destinies of modern society moving slowly or rapidly towards socialization, should understand that, even from the most utilitarian point of view, the existence of a sector of intellectual work free from the exigencies of immediate utility is more necessary than ever.

At a moment when the rational adaptation of the individual to his social functions is constantly discussed, where everything is being organized so that the young "classes" should enter as rapidly as possible the "cadres" which impatiently await them, it must be hoped that this improvement of professional training, designed to achieve its purpose quickly, should bring to birth as a counterpart a feeling of the absolute necessity to keep alive alongside all kinds of "seed beds", whose immediate social usefulness is beyond discussion, an area of spiritual freedom where growth may keep its spontaneity, where one does not look for immediate results, where factors of speed and yield should be secondary, where the essential truth should be recognized that it is often from the most disinterested theoretical non-utilitarian (sometimes also the slowest) intellectual work, that those discoveries have emerged which have most aided human progress, even in its most elementary needs—food, health, communications, etc.

It seems possible that the modern state will understand that this special place the university has held in earlier society can, and must, be maintained within society in its present phase of development, and that this necessity is probably greater than before.

Autonomy not independent from the State, but at the service of the State... This way forward is already sketched, but efforts to consolidate and widen it must everywhere be made.

Translated from the French.

FRANCE

Dr. M. Bouchard

Rector, University of Dijon

The discerning and thoughtful views set out in the paper prepared by Sir Hector Hetherington on the rôle and autonomy of universities deserve wholehearted approval, and the penetration of his judgments lends them wide significance and importance. But he himself is careful to point out that his ideas are largely the result of his experience of the university institutions of the British Commonwealth and of North America, and although similar problems may arise in countries with completely different systems of higher education, it is clear that they will not be identical in all contexts and at all times—so much so that appearances can be deceptive, and it is often difficult to perceive world-wide and common preoccupations and needs through their differences.

This is why, if confusion is to be avoided, a clear distinction must be made at once between the autonomy of universities as corporate bodies and what the report calls academic freedom—the right of every member of a university "to communicate, through his teaching—and perhaps even in wider contacts—the views to which his studies and his thought have led him". To claim that there is no connection between these two freedoms—the one collective, the other individual—would be to exaggerate; it should be recognized that they are often interlinked and interdependent. It is easy to imagine that a private university—completely independent, financed entirely by funds from its students or its benefactors and entirely self-governed but whose administrative council is motivated by religious, political or racial prejudices or by personal antipathies—might persecute or dismiss a professor whose teaching or beliefs or opinions or character were displeasing to the authorities—whereas the same professor would not be interfered with in any way in a university submitted to State control. These two freedoms are intrinsically different, and do not have the same purpose; the first, insofar as it can be completely attained and exercized, enables the university as such to appoint its members as it wishes, to determine its own admission requirements, to organize its own affairs, to carry out its own teaching activities, to award its own degrees, to dispose of its resources at will and not by the approval of an outside authority; the second is simply the right of each of its members to carry out personal research as he thinks best, to say or write what he thinks and to teach his beliefs from a rostrum and before a student audience. In countries where administration is highly centralized, the status of universities and the guarantee assured to academic staff can and should be thought of separately.

Before describing institutions, however, we must not forget that they do not exist in a vacuum, and that the use made of them and the motivations which guide them are as important as their organizational structure and formal statutes, and provide protections no less strong and effective, and unaffected by vicissitudes and change. University traditions, often criticized and mocked at along with academic robes as outdated relics of former times, remain a sort of permanent collective conscience confirming and proclaiming that freedom is inseparable from thought, that freedom is a condition of thought, and at the same time lends it nobility and dignity. Moral facts are realities, too.

It is interesting that France, in the former University of Paris, developed and gave to Europe the model and prototype of a free and autonomous academic society, and subsequently embarked on a completely different course leading finally to the establishment of State universities. For these institutions do not provide an uninterrupted continuation of a distant past, as do the colleges of Cambridge and Oxford. The old universities established at different times throughout the Middle Ages and up to the beginning of the Eighteenth Century were carried away on the tide of revolution, together with the whole structure of the Ancien Régime. Their possessions were confiscated, their degrees abolished, their staff dispersed and often persecuted, their existence destroyed so completely that they left no remains that could be pieced together in the future. Napoleon I, imbued with the ideas of the Revolution, had no wish to restore ruins, and even less to establish large and strong institutions which could overshadow his authority and which could become the breeding grounds for visionaries and centres of opposition; an opposite policy prompted him to set up, under the name of Imperial University, a body dealing only with teaching and education throughout the Empire, a body which grouped, beside the lycées and the collèges, a number of Faculties or Schools of Law, Science, Letters, Medicine and Theology, spread out over the different academic districts into which France was divided, and unco-ordinated one with another in any organic way. The "Grand Maître", later the Minister of Public Instruction, represented in each Académie by a rector appointed by him and solely responsible to him, administered this body—more recently called the

"Université de France" and, especially in the case of the institutions of higher education, set out regulations for the awarding of degrees, fixed the number of lectures to be given each week by the professors, their emoluments, their careers, determined the programmes of study, kept himself informed of all special events. The field of initiative open to the Faculties was therefore severely limited by constant interference by the authorities; and no less so by excessive parsimony in the distribution of funds, without which all activities become difficult.

Guizot was a great Minister of Public Instruction, but he expressly said that the Faculties should limit themselves to teaching and that research was the concern of the Collège de France and the Museum. This allocation of tasks and of responsibilities satisfied his sense of order, and at the same time his liking for economies. There was, however, a Council in each Faculty comprising, at least in the provinces, the three or four holders of chairs, though its power and functions were restricted to the discussion of internal organization and less important matters. All initiatives came from above, as did the resources. Many of the characteristics of present-day French universities are explained when it is remembered that they sprang from this beginning, from the very heart of this system.

State initiative paved the way for the Universities, when it decided to make the principal town of each academic province a "Faculty Town". This was accomplished either by continuing the Faculties already established, or by setting up new ones. The State gave them formal existence by the decree of 1885, instituting in each of these towns a general Faculty Council, with the Rector or the Académie as President, which to some extent increased the effectiveness of the Faculty Council, Finally, the law of 1896 gave an official blessing to the existence of the universities. But however liberal its authors may have been, it is evident that they had no wish to destroy a firmly-based structure in order to return to the institutions of the Middle Ages; that the State could not and would not disorganize the system of Public Instruction by which it paid and supervized the staff, nor give up the privileges it had held by law and by custom for nearly a century, and particularly the exclusive right to award university degrees—a right which logically carries with it the control of programmes and duration of the studies whose sanction and end they are. It would have been even more difficult to shake off the habit of counting the pennies carefully, and the professors, exactly as they had been before the 1896 reform, remained what they wanted to remain—civil servants. Nowadays, just as was the case before the establishment of the universities, higher educational matters are divided between departments—some deal with personnel, others control and supervize the use of financial resources, deal with matters of educational substance, or distribute materials and decide about buildings. Even if the Director-General is a Rector, a Dean or a university professor, the departmental heads and officials at all levels who prepare decisions and transmit instructions are administrators—each dealing only with those questions for which he is particularly and specially responsible. Between them, they play the part of a Providence which examines everything, knows everything, prepares everything, arranges everything, whose intervention is a necessary for fixing a lecture hour or a new discipline as it is for equipping a laboratory, and which decides when the golden rain of subventions shall fall. In the corridors of the Ministry, one can watch the mendicant Rectors, Deans and Professors journeying from office to office much as in Rome one sees the pilgrims moving from church to church in search of indulgences. But only the Director-General is in a position to dominate and understand the life and activities of the university in their entirety and in all their aspects.

The share of autonomy granted to the universities in 1896 was introduced into a highly centralized system, which the law has in no way destroyed or even reduced. In order to judge the limits of this independence and its real value exactly, one should not look at the over-all powers given to the Rector, since the majority of these are simply held on behalf of the Minister and are exercized in the Académie only as the Minister's representative in the institutions of National Education, in accordance with instructions. One should look exclusively at those powers held by the Rector as President of the University Council or, better still, define and enumerate the functions of the University Council itself, whose discussions he conducts and whose decisions he carries out.

This Council, according to its constitutive texts, is composed of the Rector, the Deans, two professors elected by each of the faculties, and three individuals co-opted by the others and appointed by the Rector. It deals with the administration of the University's possessions, with exemption from students' fees, with the acceptance of gifts and legacies offered without obligations or conditions, with offers of subventions, with the general organization of courses. It does no more than discuss and offer its advice on all other questions, especially the budgets and accounts of the university and of the faculties which must be put before the Minister and receive his approval. A freedom restricted in this way and subject in all circumstances and at every step to the control of a supervizing authority is exactly like that of children in leading-strings.

Children, however, are guided and help up only until they are strong and cautious enough to walk by themselves, and because one is teaching and encouraging them to do so. The French universities have from the very beginning seen their privileges and their autonomy restricted by law as well as in fact. Responsibility for the well-being of their students—which would seem logically to fall to them—was specifically given to them at their foundations as their first function. For several years now, this responsibility has been transferred by law to a central organization based in Paris, and which has a director to represent it in every Académie. Though it is true that the director submits his budget and his accounts to an administrative council presided over by the Rector, of its twelve members only three are elected by the University Council, and it can only offer an opinion on the budget and accounts —an opinion which the central administration treats as it wishes, and which in no way commits it.

In any case, if he is not an elected member of the "Conseil d'Administration des Œuvres universitaires", a Dean or a Faculty and even more a professor can know little of, and has no opportunity of appreciating, how the young men and women he teaches live. This division of work and of responsibilities, which has been hailed as progress, has had unfortunate effects on the nature of the institutions where the students find bed and board, because they are becoming boarding-houses pure and simple; it has also weakened the universities by loosening the bonds between students and professors.

No law was needed to abolish the universities' own resources. These arose from gifts and legacies, which are rare in these days when we have grown used to thinking that the responsibility for public education lies with the State; they have nowadays only a nominal value, but this does not stop the University or Faculty Councils from discussing in all seriousness the award of prizes worth as much as fifty old francs, fifty centimes today, or ten cents if you work it out in dollars. Above all, the fees paid by students have remained at precisely the same figure as before 1914; which means that they now represent no more than a ludicrous extra, and as there can be no question of raising them, the French Universities and the Faculties which compose them live almost entirely on funds granted to them by the Ministry of Education. They include regular grants renewable from year to year to cover the running costs of heating, lighting, maintenance, practical laboratory work, the acquisition of books for the library, and supplementary or extraordinary subventions to cover the cost of major repair work or granted to the Faculties for the purchase of expensive apparatus or the initial equipment of a laboratory. For these grants are made only in response to specific requests, backed up by estimates and justifications. Thus, on the one hand rules and regulations subject every step a university takes to official approval; and on the other their lack of funds reduces them to ever-increasing dependence, while at the same time the control to which they must submit becomes more elaborate year by year. It was hoped that a system of capital accounting tried out in some universities would put some accumulating funds at their disposal each year; in point of fact the reform has merely meant that they must ask permission from the Ministry to acquire any sum higher than the modest amount of a thousand francs. The result is that the Rector himself must refer to Paris before he can buy a piece of office furniture. This regulation does not in any way, of course, imply a lack of confidence, for no one fears that the Rector will develop a mania for buying up expensive and useless objects; but the administration likes to be courted for favours which it has no intention of refusing. It also enjoys enumerating and indexing all its property so that it can calculate at any moment not what its possessions are worth, because the value of scientific equipment depreciates rapidly, but what they cost. It goes without saying that the Faculties are in no better position than the universities—they too are subject to the same rules and regulations in the definition of their programmes of study and in their expenditure and that, in two words, they request and propose, but do not dispose.

As one would expect, scientific research is no less regimented. It is now officially recognized that it forms part of the everyday activities of teachers in higher education, since they receive research bonuses and the national promotion committee take their research work just as much into consideration as their abilities and their vocation as teachers. The importance given to publications in accounts of the activities of Faculties affords ample proof of the leading place they hold and the attention they are given. But because scientific research, and the special form of higher education called in France "le Troisième cycle" which is inseparable from it require buildings, materials, documents, apparatus, sometimes veritable factories and specialized labour which are very expensive, they can only exist, live, work, and produce, insofar as they are given the means of doing so. Moreover, even if a Maecenas should endow the university of his choice with substantial and unlimited financial help, the establishment of an Institute, the creation of a programme of study at the "Troisième cycle" level in a specific discipline, the definition of the work which is to be carried out and the degrees which will be awarded because of it will involve administrative decisions and permissions without which the university can undertake nothing. It is the will of the Minister which promotes or authorizes centres of research and specialized higher education, and decides where they shall be situated throughout the territory of France. In 1939, however, a "Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique" was established in France, and has absorbed the bodies previously responsible for fundamental and applied research. The Centre's tasks involve the initiation of research likely to further science or the national economy, the encouragement of that undertaken by public or private initiative, the granting of subventions to laboratories and for publications. Its administrative council includes representatives of the staff of higher education. It nonetheless constitutes an authority separate from the "Direction de l'Enseignement supérieur", and has substantial funds and a staff at its disposal, organizes its own research centres and laboratories, defines teaching programmes and allocates grants. One has every right to be disturbed by this danger of divorce between teaching and research, for teaching which is not enriched and animated by research becomes rootless and dead, and research which is not enlivened by the fresh impulses of higher education rapidly languishes and withers.

Quite evidently, confidence has not been placed in the universities in this matter, because they are still victims of the old prejudices on which Guizot based his opinions. Originally put into tutelage at the will of the Emperor, the Faculties have remained there, and the universities too have been there from the very beginning, so irresistible is the power of this centralization, which collects all the formative ideas and powers into a single administration, from which all orders are issued, all impulses provided, all initiatives and decisions taken, which hovers over every detail, watching and supervizing the agents who carry out its orders at every step.

Of course, there is a "Comité Consultatif des Universités", the majority of whose members are elected by the professors or lecturers of the various disciplines, and who are divided into sections according to their specialities—sections which themselves comprise sub-sections. This offers advice on all matters concerned with staff, scholastic and academic organization, programmes of study and degrees, and on those questions submitted to it by the Minister for consideration. There is also a "Conseil de l'Enseignement Supérieur" presided over by the Director-General, which comprises, together with *ex officio* members and individuals nominated by the Minister, members elected by the "Comité Consultatif des Universités" and professors from the major academic institutions. This "Conseil", represented between plenary meetings by a permanent section, offers its advice on the programmes, the administrative procedures concerned with the public institutions of higher education, with examinations, and with the award of degrees, on university building programmes, and on any problem referred to it by the Ministry. Finally, there is a "Conseil Supérieur de l'Education Nationale", presided over by the Minister, to which higher education, together with the other levels of education, elects representatives. This must be consulted on all questions of national importance concerning teaching or education, on draft laws, on decrees or regulations involving several levels of teaching, and on questions referred to it by the Minister. It hears appeals and gives final rulings on decisions taken by the University Councils.

It is evident that the academic staffs of the French universities do not lack organs to express their point of view, especially when this is asked for, but it is equally obvious that these bodies—whose members are originally nominated by specialists in the different disciplines—do not represent the universities as a whole. In fact, the Director of Higher Education and often the Minister himself have taken to calling the Deans of special Faculties or the Rectors of the Universities together from time to time, but these meetings are not provided for in the regulations, and cannot be considered as constitutionally correct. What is evident is the exclusively consultative nature of all these bodies, whose advice is sought but not necessarily accepted by the Minister or the Director of Higher Education. The Napoleonic principle "many may discuss, only one decides" remains the basis of the administrative structure and, all things considered, if one examines the prerogatives and powers given to the University Councils, it will be seen that these are in no worse a position than the other bodies. A few minor matters apart, they chiefly enjoy the independent privilege of formulating and introducing proposals and suggestions. This means nothing in law, but the respect and good will of the Minister towards the universities, the tradition of liberalism rooted in the soul and customs of France, the solidarity of administrators and administered working together in a common effort for the public good, mean that these suggestions are almost always favourably considered, their proposals accepted, budgets approved. There are few conflicts, the universities have no feeling of being oppressed, and they enjoy an authority, even though they have no legally-sanctioned powers. All this does not alter the fact that in a centralized country, where the Minister, with the help of consultative bodies, takes the important decisions, organizes teaching methods and allots funds, the initiative of the universities is exercized within very tight limits.

With regard to personnel, the Minister, either directly or through the Rector, appoints *assistants*, *maitres assistants*, *chefs de travaux*, and *maitres de conférences* on his own authority, provided that the candidates hold the qualifications required by law. In point of fact, where *maitres assistants* and *maitres de conférences* are concerned, he is careful to take the advice of the "Comité Consultatif des Universités" and that of the relevant Faculty on the candidate's ability and experience. For *professeurs titulaires*, he chooses them from a list of four names, two of which are proposed by the "Comité Consultatif" and two by the Faculty concerned. Happily, the suggestions of the Faculties are usually, though not always, the same as those made in the first place by the "Comité Consultatif", so that the choice generally has to be made between only two names, and the Minister will take the first on the list. Where there is disagreement, he is obliged to take a decision. The same procedure is followed for the nomination of Deans; the Assembly of Doctors of the Faculty suggests two names, and so does the University Council. If they are the same, the Minister usually chooses the one given first; otherwise he has to make a choice. The Rector of the Académie, whose powers derive from a Decree of the Council of Ministers, presides over the University Council. The presence and the intervention of a representative of governmental authority would seem at first sight to involve the negation of all autonomy; in fact, they provide a guarantee of the trace of independence and initiative which the law allows to the University Councils, since they oblige the Minister's representative, the person responsible for all public education at the academic level, to become the executor of their proposals. This apparent paradox is very reasonable and very wise in practice, since it forces the Rector to identify his views with those of his colleagues and to become the spokesman and the defender of the university whose administration is his responsibility.

It is part of the logic of the system that academic liberties exist and find their guarantees within the framework of public education and not within that of each university. It is the Minister, either through individual decisions, or by standing instructions, who authorizes Faculty professors to go abroad or to combine their teaching or research with remunerative activities for private education, for industry or for national and international organizations. He cannot deny the right guaranteed them by the constitution not only to defend their ideas in political affairs, but to stand for election and even to sit in Parliament, while at the same time continuing their teaching activities. But one fact cannot be over-emphasized— a fact which makes further comments unnecessary—and that is that once a man is appointed a university professor, his position is secure, and not even a ministerial decision can change it. He has to account for what he has done, said, or written only before an assembly of his peers, in the first place before the Council of the University to which he belongs, in the second place before the "Conseil Supérieur". There could be no surer protection against the arbitrary, and no stronger bulwark for the freedom to think, write, and teach according to one's conscience, because tradition, and the fact that liberty is to them as vital as the air they breathe, prompts all who have devoted their lives to enlarging and communicating knowledge, to defend their liberty, and when it is unjustly menaced, to stand firm in support of so worthwhile and noble a principle.

It would be a fundamental error to think that the French universities are victims of tyrannical oppression; what impedes their action and activity, if not their very existence, is the fact that the Imperial University system—an enormous organization directing all educational institutions from Paris—still weighs heavy on them, even though it is officially abolished. Far from lending them a measure of independence, the intervention of the consultative bodies elected by the staff of higher education would more likely limit the autonomy of each university taken separately from the others. It would certainly be difficult to check this tendency towards centralization and even more so to attempt to go back to its source. It is no less interesting to consider its advantages and disadvantages, and in the first place to determine the principles according to which the autonomy of universities can be established at the present time.

Originally the University of Paris—which can be considered the model and prototype for all those set up later—was a corporation, *universitas magistrorum et studentium*, enjoying all the rights normally conceded to the trade organizations of the town, together with special privileges granted them by the crown. It was this status which empowered it to grant degrees to those candidates whom it felt worthy to be part of its membership. Many of its members belonged to the Church, also, theology was considered the apex or crowning glory of knowledge. The Holy See accepted and considered its views, and approved the programme of studies; so that the University held and exercized a spiritual authority, and the teachers as well as the students enjoyed the privileged status of clerics, exempted from lay jurisdiction—and sometimes abused this privilege. But the nerve centre of its independence lay in its poverty, in the fact that a few rooms lent by religious houses with a few bales of straw to furnish them satisfied its teaching needs, and that its life did not therefore depend upon the generosity of benefactors.

Throughout the world at the present time it seems clear enough that the era of guilds is long since past. The syndicates which have to a certain extent replaced them differ basically in outlook—in the first place because instead of being limited to the confines of a particular town, they tend to group all men in a similar profession together, at the national level—and purely in order to defend their common interests. It is no less evident that, whatever support they obtain from foundations, gifts and legacies offered by generous patrons, the universities—and the new ones in particular—can no longer survive without some help from the State. Even where they take fees from their students, the funds thus obtained can only represent a drop in the ocean of their expenditures. In this way, the substructure which in former times supported the independence of universities is everywhere threatened, if not completely demolished. Naturally, since the universities are now wholly laic and engaged in secular research and education, they have broken all allegiance to the Holy See and all ties with the Roman Catholic Church. They have, however, retained a moral weight from their past, and their staffs continue to enjoy the respect previously given to clerics. It cannot be questioned that the man in the street has a different opinion of engineers of the staff of a railway line from the academic staff of a university. The men concerned may well be equally learned and intelligent; they all carry responsibility for public service; and human lives and national prosperity depend on their ability, devotion and enthusiasm, but their activities are limited to material and practical objectives, to immediate usefulness. Universities, however, are the guardians of the heritage of knowledge and moral principle built up by mankind through the ages; their vocation is to enrich and transmit it; they are responsible for the young people entrusted to them; their task is to spread the light of truth; and they retain a dignity and an authority which cannot be withdrawn or reduced without at the same time demolishing the benefits and principles whose custodians they are. The more effective the power of the State—which sets in motion the whole national mechanism and which directs and shapes public opinion by means of information—the more vital it becomes to have a spiritual authority which can represent the continuity of ideals through the passions and prejudices provoked and fostered by transient events.

This is the legacy of history. It does not preclude the new responsibilities which the universities must assume at the present time. They are no longer required—as they were only recently—to dwell in ivory towers of wisdom and knowledge, to initiate into the highest and most unprejudiced realms of knowledge a privileged class which follows the liberal professions or forms the upper layers of society. We expect the universities to play an active and effective part in national life, and work towards its prosperity. They must train ever-increasing numbers of engineers and technicians for its industry, teachers for its schools, doctors for its hospitals. They must examine the bases of its economy. They must improve labour conditions. They must increase the production of wealth by the practical application of knowledge. And at the same time they must foster discoveries in all the fields open to the genius of man, especially in those of biology and nuclear physics, whose significance we are only now beginning to appreciate. But this research, and the highly specialized education which must go with it, presupposes and needs resources which cannot be provided for every university, and we are therefore obliged to leave each particular discipline to a few of them, so as to avoid wastage of effort and money and a breakdown of efficiency. The problem is to decide how and by whom the distribution should be made.

In countries like France, where the organization of higher education is heavily centralized, where all initiative comes from the sovereign body which—together with alloting funds for specific purposes—decides on the task and responsibilities of the universities, it would appear that here are all the necessary conditions for considering an over-all plan, for imposing it and for ensuring its effectiveness. But it needs an omnipotent authority to contemplate so vast an undertaking, to consider all the factors involved, to arrange all the details, to take into account the position at the time, the context, the best moment, and the sum of the human resources without which nothing is worth undertaking. The administrators who play the part of Providence have no boundless wisdom nor universal competence. And even if they were to become inspired by all the lights of genius, they could not blow life into institutions of teaching or research which had no will to live, and which were without guiding principles of their own. Even less could they stir men to action. One of the most substantial arguments reflecting the misuse of centralization is that the universities are specially competent in matters of higher education and academic research and that their opinions therefore justify serious consideration; moreover, their initiative and impetus are conditions of progress itself and if it came to a choice between too much organization and none at all, the inadequate co-ordination of which some countries complain—or rather of which we complain for them—involves far fewer disadvantages than too strict control. An element of doubt is permissible, at least when one looks at the award of Nobel prizes.

In taking away a university's autonomy and its independent existence, one takes away its very life. When this happens, its professors feel able in all fairness to live far away from the institution to which they are tied only by the obligation to give a few hours' lectures a week; the former solidarity and friendship between teacher and student is broken, its very essence removed. These evils are more serious than lack of order and planning. Basically—and this is just as true now as in former times—universities must have independence and initiative in their own hands in order to carry out their responsibilities more effectively; the increasing weight of responsibility, the new functions we require from them, the contribution we seek from them to national prosperity and to social order can only be acquired if we have confidence in them. For the universities in France it is not a question of throwing off a yoke, for far from feeling oppressed by a tyrannical and hostile authority, they are cherished and supported by benevolent and attentive solicitude, which spares no effort to help their undertakings and minister to their needs. It would, however, be in the best interests of the universities—while at the same time preserving the benefits of co-ordination, especially the uniformity of programmes of study and the equivalence of degrees—to break away from the chains of bureaucracy and centralization which bind them and leave them with but the shadow of reality. The reins should be slackened a little. They should be allowed to manage their own affairs and be bold in new ventures. But in France we try in vain; we are not yet emancipated and have not yet shaken off the traditions and principles of the Napoleonic university any more than we have changed its appearance, and one of the most unfortunate results of over-centralization has been that the universities have come to accept this as a perfectly natural way of life. What remains to be done, when the opportunity comes, is for them to become the apprentices of a wider autonomy, and thus to learn its advantages.

UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. H. Butterfield

Master of Peterhouse
Former Vice-Chancellor, University of Cambridge

1. Sir Hector Hetherington has dealt very fully with the situation of universities in the United Kingdom so that I would not wish to do more than add one or two observations here.

2. Although it is not questioned that on particular occasions (e.g. when there has been a Royal Commission or a Committee of Enquiry) society and the state may have to bring universities to order and to make decisions concerning their function in national life, it is possible that the autonomy of a university is unwisely challenged if, through the pressure of either authority or opinion, a policy of expansion is carried to a degree which universities consider inconsistent with the maintenance of quality, the establishment of proper conditions for study, and the proper functioning of the institution itself. Something of this may be taking place at the present moment.

3. Some of the points made by Sir Hector Hetherington would seem to confirm the view that a danger of excessive outside control over university development might come from measures that would be ineffective if they did not have the complicity of the university itself, which might not always be aware of the long-term consequences of what it is doing. This would apply where offers of money are made by governments, foundations, industry, individuals etc. to the university (or to a department within it) for developments which would not have been adopted, or would not have been given the same priority, if the university had made a free choice in the free air. All this may mean no more than that though the problem of university autonomy ought to be respected by public opinion and by government, it calls for serious reflection in the university itself, which also, for its own part, ought to take the matter very seriously.

4. I have known cases in the British Isles where in my opinion the proper autonomy of universities has been overruled by lay elements in the government in the appointment to teaching posts, and the judgment of the academic people ought to have been allowed greater weight.

5. There seem to be times when the autonomy of universities conflicts with the autonomy of the academic profession. Those who have the function of managing a given university may have an interest different from that of the academic profession as a whole. This might happen e.g. in the case of differential stipends for professors etc. where a university that is run on a democratic basis may give an answer more acceptable to the profession than that of the administrators of universities. If part of the desired autonomy at the university level is the autonomy of those who do the teaching, all this would be an argument in favour of a more democratic organization in our universities (i.e. one in which those who actually do the teaching have greater voice in the decisions that are to be taken). Otherwise the autonomy of universities is liable to turn into the autonomy of professional university administrators. But the question is not an easy one, as both the academic profession and the university administrators seem to have their intellectual limitations.

MEXICO

Dr. N. Carrillo

Former Rector, National Autonomous University of Mexico

The University of Mexico is autonomous, as its name itself indicates, though this is perhaps superfluous. At first a pontifical university, made a secular one by the Revolution, and declared a National University in 1910, it acquired its present status in 1929 by virtue of a law which can only be modified at the request of the university itself. This law gives it a governing body of 15 members, elected by the professors, of whom one is replaced each year. This body appoints the Rector. Alongside him, there is the University Council, composed of the academic staff. The Rector is responsible for obtaining government funds, and these funds are subsequently allocated by the University Council and then, in the last instance, by the Administrative Council. Full autonomy is thus ensured for the university.

In the course of 35 years, this autonomy has proved its value. Admittedly there were serious tensions between 1929 and 1953, in which period the University had twelve different Rectors. I myself was the first to keep this post throughout the eight years (1953-1961) which are the legal maximum. During that time, the University knew extraordinary development. During my period of office, student numbers passed from 35,000 to 50,000. They have now reached 80,000. In 1953, the University budget amounted to 20,000,000 pesos. By 1961, this figure went up eight times and amounted to 160,000,000 pesos. In a country which is educationally under-developed, expansion of this kind is absolutely necessary, but many feared that it could only be done by sacrificing academic standards. It is perhaps true that the average level has gone down, at least if one merely takes account of the students admitted. It has gone up, on the other hand, if one takes account of those *not* admitted (now much less numerous) whose level, of course, was equivalent to zero. In fact, there are more good students than there were before, particularly in the sciences, and the University now has scientific graduates, especially in mathematics, of the highest reputation. Advanced courses have been organized which are attended by North Americans, a situation which would have been unthinkable 30 years ago. Broadly speaking, the nation is now able to satisfy its own requirements for engineers. The general result, therefore, seems overwhelmingly positive despite the difficulties. These difficulties are in fact useful in certain ways. The University, in its freedom, is the political conscience of the country: through it, the Government can learn what the true problems are, and it constitutes, so to speak, a thermometer by which the social state of the country can be accurately measured. Up to the present time, the government has been wise enough to try to keep this thermometer and leaves the University in freedom.

Translated from the Spanish.

ARGENTINA

Dr. R. Frondizi

Former Rector, University of Buenos Aires

I. University Autonomy in Argentina

A general study, even an excellent one like that of Sir Hector Hetherington, cannot reflect the full diversity of situations existing in so complex a question as that of university autonomy. Because of this, I shall deal principally with conditions existing in Argentina and which may serve as a supplement to the general study.

Following some general considerations I shall deal separately with each one of the five principal points examined by Sir Hector.

The observations which follow concern a recent period. The sharp upheavals of political affairs in Argentina, and in Latin America generally, immediately affect university life. I am dealing therefore here with observations on the period immediately following the overthrow of the Peron dictatorship and the organization of the autonomy of the State universities which followed in 1956.

The national universities of Argentina, by specific legal disposition, enjoy complete autonomy: they have their own statutes, create their own governing bodies, appoint or dismiss their teachers, fix their curricula, set up or suppress faculties and schools, determine the conditions of university admission and everything which students must achieve in order to obtain their academic qualifications—which give them the right to exercize a profession without needing to undergo any later state examination. This extremely complete autonomy is only limited by governmental financial contributions.

1. *Selection and Appointment of University Administrators and Teachers.*

By virtue of statutes approved by the universities themselves and in accordance with law, the universities are governed by a Higher Council, composed of the Rector, the Vice-Rector, the Deans of faculties and representatives of the teachers and graduates and of students; all are directly and regularly elected by members of the university. Neither in the Higher Council nor in the Faculty Councils are there representatives of the State or of any private or public organizations.

Professors in all disciplines are directly appointed by the Council on the recommendation of the Faculty Councils and without any intervention whatsoever from any person or any institution outside the university.

2. *Selection of Students.*

The universities themselves fix their entrance conditions. At the University of Buenos Aires, students must pass an entrance examination or follow special courses in order to enter the university. In some universities in the interior of the country, successful completion of secondary studies is enough.

The number of students seeking to enter university grows every year. At the University of Buenos Aires, the student population doubled between 1940 and 1950 and more recently, from 1950 to 1958, it doubled again. Thanks to a compulsory entrance examination and to other measures intended to improve the preparation of students, the figure of approximately 70,000 has been held during the last five years; in contrast the percentage of graduates has risen.

3. *Curricular Programmes.*

The Argentinian universities have complete freedom in fixing the curricular programmes.

I personally am in agreement with the conclusion set out by Sir Hector on page 21 of his paper.

4. *Choice of Research Programmes.*

The universities fix these themselves. They frequently do so in awareness of their responsibility towards the community at large, but they undergo no outside pressures.

5. *Allocation of Resources.*

This is the point at which the autonomy of the Argentinian universities is most in danger. 90% of the credits necessary for the functioning of the universities are annually alloted to them by the National Congress in agreement with a budget established by the Inter-University Council (consisting of the Rectors of the eight national universities) and transmitted to the Congress through the Ministries of Education and Economics.

Since the universities charge no tuition fees, the remaining 10% arises from services performed by the universities and from gifts.

There is one point, not without importance in the life of the Argentinian universities and Latin American universities in general, not mentioned by Sir Hector in his paper: this is the freedom that universities should have to express their opinion on major political problems or on those which in one way or another agitate public opinion.

When the country is confronted by a serious political crisis or a problem of national importance arises, everybody expects the universities to make their views known. Since the value of such opinions is of a moral kind, the fundamental result is that the universities express opinions without the slightest pressure from the state, the political parties or the Church. During the last six years, the Argentinian universities, and particularly the University of Buenos Aires, have enjoyed what one might call a moral and psychological autonomy and have passionately defended it.

The foregoing observations concern the national universities, heirs of a great tradition, and the only ones which at present count in the life of the country. The University of Cordoba was founded in 1613, that of Buenos Aires in 1821 and the other universities in the present century.

As for the private universities which for the most part are Catholic universities, they have been set up during the last five years and all have a limited autonomy, since their origin and purposes are based on fidelity to predetermined religious, philosophical and political conceptions.

II. POSSIBLE RESTRICTIONS ON UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY IN ARGENTINA

Universities are a part of the national communities in which they live. It would be childish to believe that their autonomy could be guaranteed by their own simple desire for it. It is linked to national events. The traditions of the German universities were of little avail before the omnipotence of the Nazi government. The same thing has recently happened in Ecuador. Wishing to preserve university autonomy from political intervention, the Ecuadorian democrats included in the national constitution a special clause guaranteeing university autonomy. A military coup d'état last year removed both the constitution and university autonomy.

Many positive facts, particularly those of university history in Latin America, could be cited to support the following statement: universities cannot guarantee their own autonomy. This does not mean, of course, that we should cease to try to defend autonomy within the universities themselves by taking part in street demonstrations or entering the national political arena.

Though we must redouble our efforts in favour of autonomy, we must all the same remember that it is impossible to guarantee it by seeking to set up ramparts—a sort of Maginot Line—around our universities. Such an attitude can be dangerous, for it creates an illusion of security and runs the risk of isolating the university from society and leading it to forget the duties it has towards the society which supports it.

The greatest danger of restriction of university autonomy in Argentina arises from political instability. The same is true in the majority of Latin American countries. A new constitutional government came to power on 12 October, 1963, for a period of six years. There is every reason to believe that it will complete its period of office despite the difficulties certain to arise. However, no one can be sure that this will be so. The overthrow of the constitutional regime by a coup d'état would endanger university autonomy. During the crisis of March 1962, autonomy was preserved only by great efforts, but no university or ethical principle had to be abandoned. There can be no question of preserving autonomy at the cost of weakening moral principles—for true autonomy is a psychological and moral matter. Autonomy cannot exist when the university, through fear or convenience, subordinates itself to the interests of the executive power or different governmental interests.

Despite this inalienable university principle, the task of universities cannot be to throw themselves into politics or to pray to divine providence to preserve the legal regime and national order. The university man as such can contribute to the strengthening of autonomy by trying to raise the level of university teaching and research, by insisting that the institution should concern itself with problems affecting society, by trying to ensure that it draws prestige from its work, by trying also to ensure that all its members should be convinced that autonomy is a vital necessity and responsibility, not merely a privilege, and the university man must see that this conviction is shared by public opinion and by the government.

It is only through political maturity within which an equilibrium is established between order and freedom that Latin America will achieve real and lasting university autonomy. A deeper sense of responsibility, equal in importance with autonomy, will lead to the reinforcement of autonomy itself, with the certainty that university men desire university autonomy not in order to do what seems best to them, but to work ardently for the progress of knowledge and the solution of problems confronting the community.

The foregoing observations are specially concerned with those problems of university autonomy which—in virtue of the right of the institution to decide upon its own regulations—are concerned with the constitution of its governing bodies, the appointment and dismissal of its teachers, the fixing of its curricular programmes, its entrance conditions and so on, without intervention from the government or pressures from outside the university.

The question of academic freedom—the freedom of members of the university in relation to the university authorities—is a quite different question. There are many university bodies which, though they jealously defend autonomy, show themselves dictatorial in their attitudes towards the members of their own university, both professors and students.

When university life is going forward normally, the functions of the university bodies, the duties and rights of university teachers are regulated by the statutes and these must be respected. In times of crisis, however, new and difficult problems arise, and these sometimes divide members of the same university from one another. Unfortunately the world, and Latin America particularly, is passing through a period of crisis, and there will be no lack in the future of those moments of tension when the pendulum oscillates between a demagogic and excessive toleration bordering on disorder and a dictatorial attitude which in the name of order will become sectarian or arbitrary. The oscillation of the pendulum must be kept to a minimum.

SUDAN

Sayed Nasr el Hag Ali

Former Vice-Chancellor, University of Khartoum

1. The University of Khartoum is one of those universities that owe their legal existence, and their human, as well as financial resources to the State, for the purpose of performing a specific and important function. It has been created by Act of Parliament, the school system has been designed partly in such a way as to produce candidates, qualified Government servants have been released for it, the necessary land and buildings have been provided, and funds necessary for development and the annual running expenditure have always come and will continue to come from the public Purse.

The people of the Sudan realize that they need to acquire knowledge already made available by human endeavour, develop the ability to seek new knowledge and to have well trained, well qualified personnel to possess a State, in the modern sense. So they create the University. They maintain it and they have deep interests in it. They want to know about it and they want to be able to direct and say broadly how they would like it to function, without interfering with its ability to set the details and the methods for its own functioning. The overwhelming majority realize their incompetence to interfere with the details of this rather strange institution called University, which claims to deal with the vast field of knowledge and requirements of a very complex age.

2. The autonomy of the University of Khartoum, therefore, boils down to its relationship with the Government in power, whatever its nature may be. Here I am of strong opinion that the Government, the staff of the University, the graduates, the students and public opinion understand the need for the University and the need for letting it alone to play its part. But what they fail to realize is the consequences of such latitude of freedom. The Government disapproves of students'

interference in politics, staff, students and graduates do not appreciate the Government's anxiety over student activities, and public opinion is terrified by the tempo of change with the young generation. The answer to all these problems may be found in the devotion of a few leaders in the field of education, laboriously, patiently and constantly but confidently educating all those concerned in the requirements of university education.

3. Before identifying the points at which invasions of autonomy may occur, as Sir Hector puts it, let me state very briefly the machinery by which the Sudan hopes to give autonomy to its only University.

The University of Khartoum springs from very humble beginnings or attempts at introducing modern education into the Sudan some sixty years ago. These attempts culminated in the University of Khartoum Act, 1956, passed by the first Sudanese Parliament. This Act created an institution that corresponds, more or less, to category c) on page 7 of Sir Hector's note. The University of Khartoum, therefore, is a State university. The Act passed in 1956 and amended in 1960, confers on the University a Constitution which has been shaped in the mould both of ancient academic tradition and of practical experience in the Sudan. It makes the University a statutory public corporation, controlled by a council, appointed in such a way as to make it an independent and widely representative body, capable of viewing university problems in the light of the needs and interests of the community at large, as well as of purely academic considerations. At the same time, it entrusts the general regulation of strictly academic matters to a Senate, thus ensuring that teaching and research, admission and the conferring of degrees and certificates are protected from undue administrative and political pressure.

The Council is made up of 29 members, of whom the Vice-Chancellor and the students' warden *ex officio*, and ten other academic staff elected by Senate and staff, are members. The Ministries of Finance, Education, Health, and the Gezira Board (cotton), the Public Service Commissioner, the Chamber of Commerce, and the graduates are represented by seven members. The rest are appointed by the Council of Ministers to represent the principal professions practised in the Sudan. But our experience is that all behaved as members of the Government of the University, when tackling university business.

The Council enters into contracts, acquires and maintains property, borrows and invests money, controls the finances of the University and approves the annual budget, appoints the academic staff, institutes degrees and creates colleges, institutes and faculties on the recommendations of the Senate, accepts donations and has power to make statutes binding on the University and all its members. The Head of the State is the Chancellor, who signs Statutes and approves loans and donations. As far as the form is concerned the autonomy of the University of Khartoum is therefore well provided for. Let us now turn to the actual practice and examine the actual success or failure of its application.

4. Although the form and the draft constitution of the University

of Khartoum are the creation of British educationists, yet the application has fallen to the Sudanese. This is now (1963) the eighth year since the University Act came into being, in July 1956. The Vice-Chancellor and Registrar offices were sudanized in 1957 and the Deanships and the Headships of Departments have been gradually sudanized, the last of the expatriate Deans having just retired. So, for the greater part of the eight years the University has been in existence, its administration has been handled by Sudanese who have experience of dealing with two types of government, a parliamentary-representative one and a military regime, the latter since 1958.

During this period new Faculties (nine Faculties in all) a number of departments and research units have been created and the student enrolment increased from about 800 to over 2000, and the number of Sudanese academic staff has been raised from a small fraction to about 40%. The standard of admission, graduation and appointments and promotion of staff has not only been maintained but markedly raised, where necessary. During this period not a single student or member of staff has been taken in or dismissed by other than University Authority decision. The studies commenced and ended every year and every term on the sole action of the Deans, the Senate and the Vice-Chancellor. The Ten Year Plan 1961-1970, which consolidates the existing structure of the University and puts up enrolment to 3000 and lately 5000, has been worked out by the University Authorities, but in close consultation with government departments and the Government as such, with no more than an indication of preferences on the part of the latter.

All this happened, but not without serious difficulties and grave relapses that might have endangered and are still likely to endanger the autonomy of the University. The main cause of such difficulties is the attitude of the students towards authority, in any form. By definition the University and the University students are miles apart from the practice in the fields of politics, economics and social adjustments. In a developing country like the Sudan, the problem is further aggravated by the unique position in which the undergraduates find themselves. They know, and they genuinely believe, that they can direct and lead. They feel they have a mission, and whatever achievement those in authority may realize is inadequate and in most cases suspect. The students of the University of Khartoum, through their union, which has been in suspension for the greater part of the period, took every opportunity to display to both types of government their resentment of its action in matters of national and international concern. They have been doing this by petitioning, public statements, demonstrations and co-operation and sometimes instigation of the schools and other pressure groups, parties, workers and farmers. Here the governments were often persuaded to intervene in what they regarded as a threat to public order and security. They wanted to see that certain students were dismissed, or even the University closed, for a certain period. They would have liked to see the Students Union suppressed and the University Authority, the Vice-Chancellor, include in the regulations some sort of penalty for political activity. Whereas the University Authority always maintained that disciplinary measures involve educational considerations, and that students are mature citizens, who should be subjected to the Common Law of the country, like anybody else. Naturally the decisions of the courts are not effective enough and the students who were tried for political offences in most cases got away with very light or no penalty at all. The Government blamed the judges being young men, recently graduated from the University, some of them after an active political career.

5. It is too early to foresee whether the students will ever adopt a more sober attitude in matters of public interest, or whether the government in power will be able to tolerate such an attitude as long as present conditions remain. Governments think that because the University is not under the control of the Ministry of Education, discipline is lax and the solution to the problem, therefore, lies in making the administration of the University responsible to the Ministry of Education, who will have powers to interfere, whenever and wherever it thinks necessary, without realizing the damage done in this way to the process of education in fruitful thinking and the pursuit of truth.

In my opinion the approach to the problem is an educational one, and no institutional measures are likely to be of any help. The alternative is sheer brutal force and police control. This alone can stop students from meddling with politics at this stage. The Administrative Board of the International Association of Universities, in collaboration with Unesco, may consider ways and means by which governments, university staff and students may be reached and made aware of the different aspects of the problem. The following appear to me to be possible lines of action:

a) The 1965 Conference may discuss the issue and make a statement about the place of autonomy in university education. This, I believe, if it could be arrived at, will be a strong argument available to university authorities in convincing representative bodies and governments of the need for that autonomy. Judging by the diversity of the systems represented at the Conference, and the demands of the varying geographical and historical units, it may be easy to agree in a statement that will cover a line of action to be followed but, nevertheless, it should not be difficult to agree on the principle.

b) Unesco should be able to interest governments in the question of autonomy and persuade them to send representatives to a conference, which would consider the paper of Sir Hector Hetherington, assisted by a few authorities in university education whose opinion is respected. It would at least be possible to bring home to them that the problem is of such magnitude that expert opinion is necessary, wherever any government feels like tackling it.

c) Students, and to some extent university staff, need to be re-educated in the meaning and extent of university autonomy. It is not uncommon to come across an exaggerated notion of academic freedom and university autonomy, amongst students as well as some of the staff.

The views and sentiments expressed often make the university "a state within the state". Such a fallacy can only be remedied by revealing to the university family the long way we have gone from the mediaeval concept of a university, and hence a new interpretation of the term autonomy to suit changed conditions.

Seminars sponsored by the Association on continental, regional or even national bases, can be very helpful. This may follow the pattern of that on "Higher Education and Rural Society", held in Khartoum between 2 and 6 December 1963, and sponsored by the University of Khartoum and Minerva. Sir Eric Ashby and Sir Joseph Hutchinson of Cambridge were invited to deliver three open lectures on the topic, in its broad perspective and a group of selected Sudanese from within the University and others, some thirty in all, were invited to discuss the lectures bringing in the local aspect. This was very effective and it is likely to influence the thinking and planning of those participants who are responsible for education, agricultural and economic development.

There is another area where autonomy is likely to come to the forefront as the main factor in government—university relationships. This is the expression of an opinion or the promulgation of a hypothesis or theory that has a bearing on political, economic, social or religious practice, in a country like the Sudan, by a member of the University. The problem has not arisen yet to any appreciable degree, for research by Sudanese is still in its infancy. But it is likely to come, and very soon. There is also the danger of uniformity within the University, both amongst the students and the staff. The odd personality or opinion is likely to be suppressed. This is already happening amongst the students and is hampering moral courage. Most of the students follow the herd, and are not ashamed to admit it.

Any educational approach, therefore, should take this point into consideration.

INDIA

Dr. A. C. Joshi

Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh

Writing in a few pages a report on the day-to-day working of Indian Universities with special reference to their relations with the government and the public and how far they are able to function in an atmosphere of freedom unhampered by extraneous influences, interferences and pressures is not easy. India is a large country with nearly 450 millions people and a great variety of languages, fourteen recognized as national, and an equal variety of cultural patterns. Even though all the universities and institutions of higher learning have come into being as a consequence of contact with Europe and have been established by Acts of Legislature, they show considerable variety for several reasons. The older universities like those of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay (all established in 1857) and Panjab (established at Lahore in 1882 and in the Punjab part of India in 1947) were patterned after the London University of that time. After the First World War, the subject of education in India was transferred from the Central Government to the provinces and the universities since then have been established largely by Acts of different provincial legislatures. This has resulted in many differences in their constitution. In the 1951 Constitution of India, education is again a State subject. It is not even on the concurrent list and the new universities are founded by the Acts of the legislatures of the different states. Four universities, however, were established before the promulgation of the 1951 Constitution by Acts of the Central Parliament, namely, Banaras Hindu University, Aligarh Muslim University, Delhi University and the Vishva Bharati. The background of all of them is different. Some universities like that of Mysore were established by rulers of the former princely states. In such cases, wishes of the ruling princes were naturally given special consideration. After independence there has been rapid increase in enrolment and many new universities have been established. Further there are frequent amendments of various university acts to meet the changing social environment. The situation is further complicated by the fact that certain institutions of higher education previously set up by private agencies with varied objectives have been given power to award degrees in selected fields. Then about half a dozen Institutes of Technology providing facilities for higher education in various branches of engineering and allied subjects have been recognized by the Parliament as Institutes of national importance. They award degrees like universities. The All India Institute of Medical Sciences in New Delhi also belongs to the same category. Recently, nearly half a dozen universities have been established for providing special facilities for education, research and extension in agriculture, animal husbandry and related sciences, broadly on the pattern of the Land Grant Colleges of the United States. Still, it can be said that in general the pattern of university organization in India corresponds approximately to category C of paragraph 9 of Sir Hector's paper, viz., the red brick or civic universities of the United Kingdom. The enrolment in other types of institutions is comparatively small and insignificant in a general survey of the question of university autonomy.

Two other features of university organization in India deserve mention here. Firstly, most of the universities established before Independence, as in other parts of the Commonwealth, had the Governor of the province or state as the Chancellor. This system continues in the state universities up to the present day. In the case of Delhi University, the Vice-President of India is the Chancellor and the President of the Union is the Visitor. Although the Vice-Chancellor is the executive head of the University, the office of the Chancellor is significant because he is often concerned with the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor.

The second notable feature of present university organization in India is the setting up in 1956 of the University Grants Commission. While education is a state subject, the Commission has been established under a provision of the Constitution which gives authority to the Union Government to provide for the co-ordination and determination of standards in universities. The Commission has the authority to take in consultation with the universities or other bodies concerned, such steps as it deems fit for the promotion and co-ordination of university education and for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research. For the purpose of performing these functions, it can enquire into the financial needs of the universities and allocate and disburse, out of the funds placed at its disposal by the Union Government, grants to universities, as may be necessary for their development. It can recommend to any university the measures necessary for the improvement of university education and advise the university upon the action to be taken for the purpose of implementation of such a recommendation. It can also advise the Central Government or any State Government on the allocation of grants to universities for any general or specific purpose out of the funds of the Central or State Governments. The establishment of the Commission as in the United Kingdom is a great step towards safeguarding universities from interference by agencies extraneous to them.

The position of university autonomy with special reference to the five points of paragraph 8 of Sir Hector's paper is as follows:

Selection and appointment of senior members of the University.

The Vice-Chancellors are appointed in different ways in different universities. In Bombay, Burdwan, Kurukshetra, Mysore, Panjab and Sardar Vallabhbhai universities, Vice-Chancellors are appointed by the Chancellor who as mentioned before is the Governor of the State. In some universities, like Karnatak and Nagpur the Vice-Chancellors are elected by their own Senate. In certain other universities, a committee is appointed consisting of nominees of the Senate, Executive Council, etc. and this committee suggests three names to the Chancellor out of which one is selected by him for the Vice-Chancellorship. In most cases the State Governments are not directly involved in the appointment of Vice-Chancellors. The only exception is Bihar where recently the State Government has taken the power to appoint the Vice-Chancellors in the six universities of the State.

Universities have been so far free to appoint their own staff but there have been two deviations in this regard recently. Firstly, in Uttar Pradesh, the U.P. Universities Regulations Amendment Act passed in 1962 lays down the qualifications for different categories of posts. In Bihar, the State Public Service Commission has been given the authority of selection of teachers for the six state universities. Such legislation is very much resented by the universities concerned as well as by the Inter-University Board of India as also by other circles concerned with higher education. The State Governments, however, try to justify their action by saying that the university authorities had not been making proper appointments.

Selection of students.

In regard to the selection of students the universities are free to follow their own policy but in certain states in South India, in some government managed colleges, the government has been fixing quotas for various categories of people based on backwardness. This has aroused strong criticism from many quarters. In other parts of the country, the Central and State Governments have been bringing to the notice of the universities the question of uplift of backward people and have been suggesting to the universities to reserve some seats for students belonging to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. The universities have generally voluntarily agreed to this for a limited period with the reservation that the students are not much below the standard of those admitted on merit. Such reservations are made largely only in professional courses

Curriculum and Standards.

The universities have been virtually free to draw up the regulations for various examinations as well as syllabi for various subjects and to determine the standards required for obtaining various degrees and diplomas. In fact, people outside the universities have shown little interest in such details, except for occasional articles and letters in newspapers. These have been written largely by teachers, former teachers or others interested in education. A considerable uniformity in standards in the country, however, has been attained firstly by drawing a great deal from British traditions and secondly by discussion at meetings of the Inter-University Board of India, a voluntary association of Indian Universities. The standards of professional education however, are considerably influenced in India by such bodies as the Indian Medical Council and the All India Council of Technical Education.

The University Grants Commission has started recently to influence the universities with regard to the details of various courses by appointing Review Committees. The Committees consist of experts, mostly professors from Indian Universities but sometimes also from foreign countries. These committees survey the courses in various subjects in different universities in the country, point out their weaknesses and recommend suitable additions and alterations. This effort is directed towards modernizing the courses and bring them up to the level of technologically advanced countries. The reports of the Review Committees are made available to the universities for their guidance. This is a recent development and so far has not had much impact on university studies, but within a few years the influence of such reports is expected to increase considerably. As the Review Committees consist largely of university professors, their recommendations cannot in any way be considered as infringement of university autonomy.

Research Programmes.

The university teachers in India are free to select their research programmes but as in other countries, the direction of research and the problems tackled are being continuously influenced by the availability of funds. The resources at the disposal of universities being limited, the teachers often approach directly or through their university bodies like the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Indian Council of Medical Research, Research Programme Committees of the Planning Commission and sometimes even foreign foundations for assistance. As grants from such bodies can be availed only for specific projects, they naturally have a direct effect on research programmes of university teachers.

The students preparing dissertations or theses for the Master's or Doctorate degree are free to choose their subject in consultation with their teacher. The selection, however, is obviously influenced, particularly in the case of science subjects, by the kind of apparatus, equipment and facilities for research available in the department.

Assessment of the facilities required and the allocation of resources.

The Indian universities generally have a block or statutory grant, from the University Grants Commission in the case of Central Universities and from the State Government in the case of State Universities. They are free to utilize this grant as well as the income from fees, endowments and other sources like rentals of buildings and allocate it to different departments and services, as they think most appropriate. No reference to the government is necessary for this purpose. For further development, however, the universities have to go either to the Central or State authorities for additional funds. At this stage, the authorities get an opportunity to examine critically the proposals made by the universities. The grants of the universities set up by Acts of Central Parliament, both for meeting recurring expenditure as well as for development, are paid by the University Grants Commission. These universities, therefore, have ordinarily no need to approach the Government directly even for their further development. The universities founded by the Acts of State Legislatures had until recently to look to the State Governments only for financial support. They still do so. However, with the establishment of the University Grants Commission and on account of the Central Planning Commission placing most of the funds required for university education with the University Grants Commission, the development even of the State Universities in recent years is being increasingly financed by this Central authority. The needs of the universities, both Central as well as State, are assessed by the Commission with the help of expert committees. The Commission is thus exercizing a great deal of influence in the allocation of funds to the different universities for teaching as well as research. Some of the Commission grants to State Universities, however, require matching funds from the State Government. Such universities, have, therefore, to approach the State Government for the matching funds and maintenance grants. The decisive influence of the State Governments in the exercize of this power is gradually decreasing. The universities welcome grants from the Commission because in this case their needs are scrutinized primarily by teachers and scientists. In the field of technical education, the All India Council of Technical Education examines first the proposals put up by the universities and advises U.G.C. regarding allocation of funds. However, the Council's advice is not final. In its dealings with the universities, it functions very much like a visiting committee of the University Grants Commission and the Commission have the final voice in the assessment of the needs and the distribution of funds to the universities even for technical studies.

Conditions that restrict the autonomy of the universities or that may jeopardize it in the future.

Although distinct, the universities are part of the society in the midst of which they function and the freedom that they can exercize in doing their essential business without reference to or constraint by external authority obviously depends to a great extent on the political climate of the country and the constitution of its government. In recent years, there have been violent changes in the governments of several nations that gained freedom from foreign rule after the Second World War. This has happened even in countries which were previously part of the British Empire and are now members of the Commonwealth. India, however, has been fortunate to have since its Independence a stable government based on parliamentary democracy. In spite of serious economic and political difficulties, the country enjoys a great measure of freedom of speech and expression. While no one can be sure of the future one can assume from the experience of the last two general elections that this system of government is likely to continue. if so, it is certain that the universities in general will continue to enjoy a great deal of autonomy as defined by Sir Hector Hetherington and will be able to function without much interference by extraneous agencies. In fact, with the further expected expansion of the activities of the University Grants Commission, it is quite likely that the universities may gain even more independence than they had in the years immediately after the attainment of national independence. The late Prime Minister who has been in office from 1947 to 1964 has both in public speeches and confidential despatches advised the State Governments repeatedly not to interfere in the affairs of the universities even in their own interest. The first Education Minister of the Central Government, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, was a great supporter of university autonomy. His successor, Dr. K. L. Shrimali, at the Vice-Chancellors' Conference held two years ago went out of his way to stress the autonomy of the universities. The university circles for this reason were greatly shocked when the Central Government under the Foreign Exchange Control Rules selected certain Vice-Chancellors for participation in the Commonwealth Universities Conference. This was regarded as a gross violation of university autonomy and this led to severe criticism of the government from many platforms. It is hoped that such action will not be repeated. The present Minister of Education, Shri Mohammad Ali Chagla, is strongly against any interference in university affairs by political parties or government and has given public assurances to this effect.

While the relations between the Central Government and the Universities have in general been happy, it cannot be said so for all state governments. There have been often irritating situations. The points at which the State Governments can interfere in the work of the universities are chiefly two. One arises from the appointment of Vice-Chancellors. As mentioned previously, by an amendment of Universities Acts, the Government of Bihar has taken powers in its own hands to appoint the Vice-Chancellors. This makes the Vice-Chancellors dependent upon the state Government both for appointment as well as continuation in office. In other States where the Chancellor is the appointing authority, the question has arisen whether the Chancellor, who is the Governor of the State, is to act on his own discretion or on the advice of the Government (the Council of Ministers) as required in political matters. The consensus of opinion in university circles is that the Chancellor should act independently and without reference to the State Government. This view has been formally put forward by the Vice-Chancellors' Conference in 1962. It is, however, not legally established whether the Chancellor can exercize his power independently of the advice of the State Government. Different procedures have been adopted in different States. The Central Government has reacted to the situation by taking up the preparation of a model university Act. When ready, this would be circulated to various state governments for their guidance. Under an ambiguous constitutional position, the relations of the universities vis-à-vis the State Governments have been greatly influenced by the personalities of the Chancellors, Chief Ministers and the Vice-Chancellors.

The second factor which indirectly brings the influence of the State Governments to bear on the working of the universities is the increasing dependence of the latter both for maintenance and development on public funds. The cost of higher education, as in other parts of the world, is rising rapidly. Donations are hardly available from private sources. The state universities have to approach the state governments for grants to meet the increasing cost of maintenance as well as development in areas not covered by the University Grants Commission. In this situation, it is possible for the governments to directly or indirectly influence university decisions. The possibility of such interference, however, has now been offset by the establishment of the University Grants Commission. As in the coming years, most of the grants for development of the universities are likely to be channelled through the Commission, the interference by political groups in their internal affairs is expected to decrease.

The most serious threat to university autonomy and its health in India stems today not so much from government as from unions of students and factions of teachers. The students in certain states have exercized undue pressure on universities and some times brought them even to a stand-still by organizing demonstrations and stikes. The universities in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar have been particularly vitiated by such pressures or what has become known in India as student indiscipline. Even a more serious threat to university health is posed by teacher politicians and academic intrigues as indicated in paragraph 10 of Sir Hector's paper. Much is expected by the public today from educational institutions and particularly from the universities. In the revolution of rising expectations, common to all underdeveloped countries, and limited resources, any shortcomings on the part of the teachers and university authorities arouse strong public criticism and are bound to bring in their wake government interference. As mentioned earlier, the State Governments of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh give this reason for the amendment of the University Acts in the two States which openly infringe university autonomy as understood in Commonwealth countries and expounded in Sir Hector's paper.

Translated from the German.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Dr. E. Lehnartz

Former Rector, University of Münster

All universities* in the Federal Republic of Germany are State institutions. As the states (Länder) have sovereignty in cultural affairs, every university is dependent on the government of the state in which it is situated. This means that the financing and administration of universities vary in certain particulars. However, the following account of conditions basically applies to all universities.

1. *Selection and appointment of university staff—the teacher, research worker and administrator (para. 11 of the Report of Sir Hector Hetherington).*

In the West German universities there is no office corresponding to that of the "chancellor", or to that of the chairman of the lay or mixed lay and academic governing body.

Academic self-government is the responsibility of the rector, senate and faculties. The central organ for academic administration is one "small senate" to which the rector, prorector, deans and elected members of the senate belong. The main duty of the rector—who as a rule is elected annually by university members who have their "habilitation" (re-election is possible once)—is to represent the university in its external relations.

Academic autonomy is relevant to all questions that arise directly from research and teaching. The freedom of research and teaching is guaranteed through the constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany. The academic autonomy of the university is protected by this guarantee of freedom. However, in practice, difficulties occasionally arise because of the fact that the rector is elected annually, changes at least once every two years, and is usually inexperienced in administrative matters.

---

* The term "university" is here used to cover the "Hochschule" as well as the university in the narrower sense.

For financial administration, there are the following alternative types of procedures:

a) The university's financial administration is taken out of the sphere of its own competence and entrusted instead, as a state responsibility, to the management of a government official (curatorial system).

b) Universities participate in their financial administration to the extent that the membership of a curatorial committee also includes university teachers. However, this committee is a non-academic body.

c) The university is responsible for its own financial administration, but this is subject to supervision by the state government.

The faculties alone have the unrestricted right to award the "Habilitation" (which confers the right to membership of a faculty and the right and duty to deliver lectures).

In the appointment of ordinary (ordentliche) professors, the faculty has the right to make recommendations. The appointment itself is made by the Minister of Education. But, by convention, the recommendation of the faculty is binding, unless there are compelling grounds against the recommended appointment.

The procedure for the appointment of assistants, who are not responsible for teaching, and the assignment of teaching tasks in fields that are not covered by ordinary professors varies considerably in different cases; nevertheless the selection is always made either through a university teacher or through an organ of the autonomous academic governing body.

Officers for academic administration are appointed and supervised by organs of the academic administration and officers for financial administration by organs responsible for this.

Ordinary professors, as a rule, cannot be dismissed. After reaching a certain age limit they retire, but as emeritus professors retain the right to teach. They are civil servants, but the supervisory rights of the state's civil service regulations are restricted by the constitutionally assured guarantee of freedom of research and teaching. This guarantee finds its limits only in the general code of criminal law. The professors are subject to these laws just as much as all other citizens. Apart from this, in disciplinary matters, every member of the university is subject to the disciplinary powers of the relevant academic, or in certain cases state, organs.

2. *Selection of Students (para. 12 of the Report).*

Standards of admission requirements (Hochschulreife) are set by the State with due regard for what the universities consider necessary pre-conditions for fruitful academic study ("Abitur-Maturum"). The secondary school certificate is valid for all university disciplines. The constitution assures all Germans the right to a free choice of educational institutions. Therefore a university can restrict the admission of German students with secondary school certificates only insofaras this is justified by limitations of space.

Thus, in respect to admission of students, autonomy is limited by the constitution and the state's competence to set standards for the secondary school certificate. Theoretically, the universities could—if necessary—influence admission requirements through the introduction of additional preparatory courses at the universities.

3. *Determination of curricula (para. 13 of the Report).*

The freedom of teaching is to a certain extent restricted by examination regulations. In practice, this does not apply to the regulations for academic examinations (the doctoral, the diploma and master's [Magister] examinations), as these are drawn up by universities themselves and are only approved by the State. The regulations for the State examinations, which are held and also largely standardized by government agencies, require attendance at a series of compulsory lectures and practical work. They do not, however, limit the autonomy of the university in the sense of requiring it to restrict itself to the curricula set out in the examination regulations. The State examinations are conducted by examining committee comprising academic, or academic and governmental, representatives.

To ensure co-ordination in academic examination regulations, which are drawn up by individual universities, or in certain cases by faculties, with the approval of the respective State (Land) Minister of Education, a joint commission for examination and study regulations has been established by the West German Rectors' Conference (Rektorenkonferenz) and by the Standing Conference of State Ministers of Education (Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder) in the Federal Republic of Germany. This works out basic regulations for the different disciplines. New faculty examination regulations that deviate from the basic regulations can not be approved by the Ministries.

4. *The choice of research programmes (para. 14 of the Report).*

Basically, research within the university is free (cf. nos. 1. and 3. above). There is no planning—not even of different research projects carried out within one single university. In the university's budget, funds for research are provided through a block grant. The distribution of these funds is arranged through organs of the academic administration. Moreover, individual research workers can ask for further funds for certain projects from the German Research Association (Forschungsgemeinschaft), of which the universities are members. Grants are decided by a committee consisting of professors (who are in a majority) and government representatives. Funds are placed at the disposal of the Research Association mainly by the Federal Government, but in part also by the States, and private business and industry.

In certain respects university research also receives considerable financial support from private and official sources. The university has no influence on the scope of such financing, and is informed of it only insofar as such funds pass through the financial office of the university or institute. It is part of the responsibility of the individual research worker to make sure that accepting external research commissions does not jeopardize the university's own interests.

5. *Determination of requirements and allocation of resources (premises, recurring expenditures, capital investments) with due regard to all view points (para. 15 of the Report).*

The university's budget is, as a rule, established by the State Ministry in collaboration with the university. The extent of the university's rôle in this varies considerably in different States (Länder). The parliament of the "Länd" approves the budget, and indeed every single item in it.

Finances required for the expansion of the university are also decided by parliament. Here, as a rule, it follows the recommendations of the "Wissenschaftsrat" (Scientific and Academic Council). The "Wissenschaftsrat" was founded in 1957, through administrative agreement between the Federal Government and the States. It consists of an administrative commission and an academic commission. Members of the academic commission are appointed by the Federal President on the recommendation of the West German Rectors' Conference, the German Research Association (Forschungsgemeinschaft) and the Max-Planck Society. Members of the administrative commission are Ministers or high officials of the Ministries of Education or Finance and or relevant Federal Government departments, and also include some public personalities appointed by the Federal President. The main tasks of the "Wissenschaftsrat" are to work out an over-all plan for the promotion of science and learning, to establish an annual programme of urgent priorities, and to make recommendations on the utilization of funds made available for the advancement of knowledge in the budgets of the Federal Government and the States.

⁂

1. In the Federal Republic, the autonomy of universities in the recruitment of teaching staff, in the orientation of research, and in the organization of teaching is guaranteed by law and at present is in no danger.

2. Since the eighteenth century until the founding of the Free University of Berlin and the University of the Saar, there was no financial autonomy for universities in Germany.

3. In the general context of these two points one may, however, discern certain dangers to autonomy:

a) The *external* threat is of a manifold kind:

— Since 1960, the considerably increased public expenditures on universities have caused increased supervision by the government administrations. In one State (Bavaria) the actual spending of the universities' budgets is possible in practice only with constant administrative intervention by the Ministries of Education and Finance. If autonomy signifies freedom in the disposition of resources for academic purposes, then such autonomy is in fact excluded by the above administrative procedure.

The continuous growth in the relations of private business with universities—particularly with their natural science institutes—has for instance in the case of Kiel (i.e. a university without an industrial background) led to a situation where 30% of the university's budget is met by contributions from third parties, which are obtained through the efforts of directors of institutes. Thus in the legally protected sphere of autonomy, there are intruding influences against which there is no legal protection, and which can also not be controlled by the university as a whole.

Hitherto, no university institute has been prepared to carry out secret research for the Federal Defence Ministry, i.e. where publication of results is not allowed.

b) Corresponding to the external threat to autonomy there is also a threat from *within:*

— The greatest danger, in my view, arises from those university teachers who have big institutes and carry out work on behalf of private business. Such directors of institutes make full use of the rights conferred on them by autonomy but, on the other hand, are not so concerned to observe the duties arising from their membership of a body enjoying autonomy.

Through the selfishness of faculties, and in particular the medical faculties, the interpretation of university autonomy as autonomy for the faculty—which happens far more in universities than in technological institutions—largely results in bringing discredit on the university institution as a whole, and in crippling its organs.

Also the amorphous, unco-ordinated masses of students, who are represented in a merely formal way by student unions, in the long run become a danger to autonomy. In contrast with the past, but as is happening also with many university teachers, the corporate teacher-student sense of community, and thus of responsibility, is no longer aroused by autonomy.

ISRAEL

Dr. B. Mazar

Former Rector, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

2*. The Hebrew University functions as the Hebrew University Association under the Ottoman Law of Associations. At the same time it is recognized as a body corporate under the Council for Higher Education Law.

9. The governing bodies of the University are as follows:

a) The Board of Governors is the supreme body of the University which makes statutes and determines policy on the recommendation of the Senate and the Executive Council. It is a self perpetuating body of 120, composed half of Israelis and half of members from abroad.

b) The Executive Council represents the Board of Governors in Israel. 22 members of a total of 30 are non-academic and the remainder are academic members elected by the Senate.

c) The Senate, the highest academic body, deals with matters of academic policy and is composed of all full Professors, Deans, the Director of the Library and representatives of other grades of the academic staff. It deals with all matters of general academic policy.

11. a) Appointments of Academic Staff:

i) The Appointments Committee for senior staff deals with the appointments and promotions from the grade of instructor to full professor. It is composed of 5 members of the Executive Council and 5 members of the Senate. It conducts its deliberations on the strength of a report received from a professional committee who in turn invite expertises from abroad.

ii) The Appointments Committee for junior staff deals with the appointments of assistants and other teachers below the rank of instructor. It is composed of representatives of the Executive Council, the Senate, the University Administration and the Assistants Organization.

---

* These figures refer to the paragraph numbers of Sir Hector Hetherington's paper.

b) Appointments of Administrative Staff.

The President and the Vice President(s) are elected by the Board of Governors. The Executive Vice President(s) are appointed by the Board of Governors, other high officers by the Executive Council.

c) All academic staff from instructor onwards hold tenure after probationary periods.

12. a) The University is free to determine the number of students which are admitted to the various faculties. Up to now admission to the faculties of Humanities, Social Sciences and Law are not limited. Admission to the faculties of Medicine, Science and Agriculture are limited in accordance with the possibility of absorption in the laboratories.

b) The standard of preliminary attainment entitling to admission in all faculties is the matriculation certificate.

c) There are no special qualifications for admission to specific courses except for the concourse of admission in the Faculty of Medicine and other experimental faculties.

d) There are at present 9400 students. The Student Body is expected to grow to more than 12,000 by 1968. The question of selecting admission to the non-experimental faculties is being raised.

e) There are no other qualifications for admission than educational fitness. No limitations of race or creed exist.

13. a) No pressure by this state or outside organizations is exercized to adapt the curriculum to specific practical needs.

b) In the Humanities and Social Sciences, in addition to the purely professional preparation, Basic Studies in Judaica, General Humanities and Foreign languages are required from students.

c) The University is free to set its own standards of examinations.

14. The University is at liberty to choose its own research programmes. Much organized research, financed from outside sources, is of a basic nature. There is an authority for research and development composed of—exclusively—members of the University which deal with all questions of organized research.

15. Formally the budget is adopted by the Board of Governors on the recommendation of the Executive Council. The actual proposal is worked out by the University Budget Committee composed of Deans, the Director of the Library and heads of administrative departments and chaired by the Executive Vice-President (Administration). In spite of the scarcity of resources full consensus is always reached.

16. a) Grants to Institutions of Higher Education appear in the Budget Proposal of the Ministry of Education. The real decision, however, about the total size of the grant and the allocation and its distribution among the institutions is in the hands of the Treasury. In case the grant asked for by the University is not forthcoming in full the University is free to adapt its budget in accordance with its own list of priorities.

b) In theory the Council for Higher Education has the power of recommending the distribution of grants among the institutions of higher education. In practice it has not exercized this function. The whole question of relations between Government and Universities is at present under consideration.

Student Participation in University Government.

There is a self-governing students' organization which runs cultural and mutual aid activities, a labour exchange and a duplicating and printing service. It does not participate in the general government of the University, nor has it any influence on the content of instruction or standards of examinations. Its representatives, however, have the right to request hearings from the Board of Governors. Health and housing services are run in co-operation by the University Administration and the Students organization.

JAPAN

Dr. T. Morito

Former President, University of Hiroshima

In Japan there are the following three categories of universities and colleges:

State universities and colleges	72
Public universities and colleges	34
Private universities and colleges	185
Total	291

The present situation of university autonomy varies to a considerable extent with those three different categories of universities. Of those three categories of universities, state university is a champion for university autonomy both from the historical point of view and from its present situation, since at state universities there exists university autonomy in comparatively definite form and further there is found among the universities homogeneity in this field to a considerable extent. In contrast with it, the autonomy of private universities is less homogeneous and well-defined, and that of the public universities is in many respects to be considered the same as that of the state universities.

For this reason, bearing in mind the five main points raised by Sir Hector, I will give a brief account of the autonomy of the state university.

Before going into description, I would like to point out the following. The postwar educational reform in Japan was greatly influenced by the educational system of the United States of America, the universities being no exception. As far as the autonomy of state universities is concerned, however, it seems that it has continued to be under the influence of German universities in many respects, which had been strong in the prewar days. In the meantime, private universities have been under the influence of American universities, and the administration of each of them, though its extent varies, is mostly in the hands of the board which includes usually former graduates of the institution. The university autonomy and the problems thereof in the case of the private universities, therefore, are different from those of the state ones.

1. *Selection and Appointment of Presidents and Professors.*

For the Japanese state university, there exists no organ or governing body which is wholly or partly composed of the people outside the university, except the Minister of Education who is the founder of the university and in the highest responsible position for education in the country. In other words, there is neither the chancellor nor pro-chancellor and the lay or mixed governing body of British style nor the board of trustees of American style. The organs for university administration under the existing system are president, university council, deans of faculties and faculty council, each having its respective competence outside of the Minister of Education who is finally responsible for the affairs of the state university. The most important of them all is no doubt the president. In the selection and appointment of the president, a well qualified person is selected by vote from among the professors at the university or persons outside the university and is appointed by the minister of education. In selecting an expected president by vote, the electors are generally professors, assistant professors and full-time lecturers, but at a few universities this is limited only to professors. At the state university of Japan, the all-round responsibility for the university administration in its internal and external relations rests with the presidency; and the selection and appointment of the president is made solely under the election system within the university. This has a little different meaning from Sir Hector's description.

Next comes the selection and appointment of professors. First, the faculty council, composed only of professors of the faculty in question selects expected professors in most cases from among the teaching staff of the faculty, and finally, the Minister of Education appoints them professors upon the decision by the council. In the procedure, deans of faculties, university council and president usually transmit to the Minister of Education the results of the selection by the faculty council. Public recruitment of candidates for professors is made in some cases, but the inclusion of the persons outside the university in the members of the nomination committee is quite exceptional. In addition, professors at state universities of Japan, once so appointed, hold their professorship until they reach their age-limit, unless unexpected situations should occur.

For these points, the practice in the selection and appointment of president of and professors at the university is far from what Sir Hector suggested; that is, there exists no "decisive role" to be played by the head of the university in "the selection and appointment of the academic staff of university"; due consideration is not being paid to "the recruitment of the best qualified persons from as many sources as available".

2. *Selection of Students.*

Also Japanese universities, in compliance with the national and social needs and also with the needs of professional organizations and individual citizens, are conducting research and professional education requiring high standard of academic quality. At the same time the universities are in danger of extending their enrolment beyond their capacity of academic instruction and guidance under the strong pressure of democratization of higher education.

Qualifications for matriculation are in inseparable relation with the system of the admission to the university. In Japan, it is stipulated that each university may give, within the framework of general agreement, their own matriculation to those who have finished the upper secondary school course (or senior high school course). The number of those who wish to enter the university, however, is much larger than the capacity of the universities, and the competition among prospective students has been getting so keen as to bring about the so-called ordeal of entrance examination. It is now held that the admission system of the present day has led to not only imposing heavy burdens, mentally and materially, upon the applicants and their family, but to disturb the educational system of Japan as a whole. Those circumstances are in a striking contrast to what Sir Hector points out, namely, that a university has an obligation to pay due consideration to the influence of the requirement of the university upon the education of the nation as a whole and for the students to be admitted to university methodical, systematic and thorough instruction is more important than the actual standard of attainment.

3. *Determination of the Contents of Curricula.*

In Japan, the basic principles of higher education are prescribed by the School Education Law, and thereupon each university prepares educational programmes and offers instruction to the students. The educational programmes are prepared by each university in accordance with "University Standards" and "University Establishment Standards" and no professional organizations are concerned directly in the making of them. In the preparation of the curricula for the studies of medical science, and technology, and for teacher training, however, national and social needs are fully considered.

University education in Japan is divided into professional and general. Criticism has been directed by the industrial world and professional organizations to the education because of the degradation of professional knowledge rather than of the insufficient technical and practical training. Such degradation of professional knowledge is considered to have been caused by the introduction of general education at the expense of professional education. General education is a new programme which was introduced by the post-war educational reform. It has now formed a part of the established curricula, although it has even at present been under criticism and re-examination in various quarters.

As to the conferment of academic degrees, there exist Rules of Conferment of Degrees and The Outline of the Examination Standards for Postgraduate Course in accordance with which the university with postgraduate courses has instituted its own regulations. The presentation of degrees is to be made under the responsibility of the individual university, and there exists neither a system for nor a practice of intervention from outside the university. In Japan, those who have the prescribed qualifications, even though not having completed the doctor course, may apply for the doctorate by submitting a doctorate thesis.

4. *Choice of Research Programme.*

It is generally accepted in Japan that in research at the university greater emphasis should be placed upon theoretical ones and, at the same time, the actual national and social needs as far as possible should be taken into due consideration. In this respect, however, there exists no authoritative organ at present, as Sir Hector urged for its existence, which has the competence to make a fair distribution of research projects among various institutes, taking a wide view of the whole situation and having a perspective of the whole research activities required for the security and welfare of the state and community.

In addition measures to enable the university to obtain funds for studies from outside under more favourable terms, for example exemption from taxation, are insufficient, and there has been less developed "a central organization" to contemplate the all-around research programme and to watch in autonomous research lest the assistance from outside the university might impair it.

5. *Allocation of Resources.*

To maintain sound university management, the required amount of funds must be ensured and allocated in well-kept balance among different activities, and further, in so doing, is must be made possible to appropriate the funds for long-term programmes and to use it in a flexible way. To do this, according to Sir Hector, the most desirable thing is an autonomous decision by the university as a whole. The allocation of financial resources to individual state universities is made on the basis of the budgetary appropriation for state universities as a whole, prepared by the Ministry of Education co-ordinating the autonomous decision of each university. It is then approved by the Diet.

It occurs sometimes that in making such autonomous decisions the university has difficulty in co-ordinating contradicting decisions of its faculties. Further, the annual appropriation is divided into small portions not easily transferable from one item to another, thus complicating university management.

Diversity of University Autonomy.

University autonomy when considered in its meaning today should be held not as an abstract concept but as a practical measure which is believed to be appropriate for fulfilling the functions expected of and entrusted to the university in the present state and society. In this respect, I should like to discuss university autonomy in terms of the actual practice as Sir Hector expressed it.

University autonomy so considered will vary with the stage of development of and the system of state and society, and also with types of universities themselves. As the university is influenced to a larger extent by political and social conditions, so university autonomy is influenced by both of them. The types of university autonomy are diverse. As those in democratic countries are different from those in totalitarian ones, so are those in advanced countries different from those in developing ones. My belief is, therefore, that we must be very careful not to criticize imprudently university autonomy under different conditions either by the idea of complete autonomy or by specific types of autonomy in certain nations and cultural regions.

Now the current problems of university autonomy particular to Japan seem to have been caused not chiefly by direct political interference with academic freedom and the autonomy of the university but by the change in the actual situation and the confusion in the concept of university autonomy which has been brought forth by radical political and social reform.

Some may say that still in Japan of today the state often presents a threat to university autonomy as it did in prewar days, and that today there only lies a danger of the autonomy. I should say it is wrong. Because the troubles and accidents in their minds were caused by revolutionary political movements in and outside the university which were led by radical student organizations or a small group of teaching staff at universities. Almost all the troubles and accidents were not related to academic freedom and therefore to university autonomy in its true sense.

University Autonomy in Prewar Days.

In prewar days, Japan was a constitutional monarchy with the remnants of absolute monarchy in a powerful military setting. Academic freedom and the autonomy of the university were under strict control. Under such circumstances both the freedom and the autonomy were gained gradually by resisting assiduously such strict control and oppression, and by the devoted efforts on the part of a few progressive universities.

In the meantime, the influential state universities followed mainly the examples of the German ones. Under their leadership, the autonomy of Japanese universities followed the German type rather than the British, American or French. This led to an ideological concept of autonomy rather than to the practical concept based upon "experience and expediency".

Japanese universities have thus repelled any participation in university affairs from any outside forces to guard their autonomy. Thus they succeeded in preserving in the hands of university authorities the practical competence of appointment of professors and the selection of the president, generally held as the basic principles of university autonomy.

The following three characteristics of university autonomy in prewar days may be pointed out:

1. It was believed that the university was not a social institution, but an ivory tower secluded from both the nation and community; university autonomy could therefore be developed further through distrust and resistance than through understanding and co-operation.

2. As a result of attaching too much importance to the status of faculties, the importance of the university as an organic entity was underrated.

3. In effect, the utmost importance was attached to the decision by the faculty council in the selection of professors, and a reluctant or even opposing attitude was held to the recruitment of candidates from among the public, to the inclusion of people outside the university on the selection committee, and to paying high regard to the opinions and views of the president and the university council.

New Universities in the Postwar Days and University Autonomy Thereof.

With the political and social reforms under the Occupation of the Allied Forces after the Pacific War, the people's sovereignty was proclamed, militarism removed and Japan changed into a highly democratized state. Simultaneously, the educational system was reformed, and included the establishment of the new system of higher education. This opened a new era to academic freedom and the university autonomy. The practice in university autonomy has not only been institutionalized but the autonomy enjoyed only by a small number of imperial universities in the prewar days, extended once and for all, to more than 200 new universities; though there is a variation in the forms of autonomy in state, public and private universities. It is not so hard to imagine that such a drastic reform has brought into university administration and autonomy many and serious problems. The following are the two major reasons for such situations.

1. In the new democratic state, the conception of university autonomy would have to change from that of the closed and antagonistic to that of the open and co-operative, since the character of the university as a social institution was intensified. In fact, however, there is an overwhelming conservative tendency on the part of most universities to preserve out-of-date concepts of university autonomy under the new regime.

2. In prewar days university autonomy had been enjoyed by a few imperial universities, especially the University of Tokyo and that of

Kyoto which had been playing a leading role among Japanese universities, historically and academically. Through the educational reform after the war, university autonomy was granted to more than two hundred colleges and universities without exception. Of these, a large number were former intermediate schools hurriedly upgraded to colleges or universities, despite their lack of preparation.

University autonomy was thus suddenly granted from above to colleges and universities that had neither the experience nor the training for it. Under these circumstances it is not hard to see why university autonomy in its proper sense was neither fully understood nor rightly applied, and continues so, even in these days.

Students' Self-Government and University Autonomy.

The other element posing a problem of university autonomy in Japan is the radical political-social movement led by a group of university students and sometimes by a few teaching staff. Radical activities not permitted out of campus have been launched under the guise of university autonomy by a group of students, staff and educational personnel in the university.

The most neteworthy of these movements is that of the so-called Zengakuren (National Students' Self-Government Association) which attracted public attention by its drastic, unlawful political actions. When this movement was in full swing, students councils were organized at almost all of the universities especially at the state ones, and all of these student councils were more or less under the control of the Association. Even some of the teaching staff seemed to support the movement of Zengakuren.

The university could not be indifferent to the radical and sometimes violent political activities of the Association especially when they had a base to work and launched unlawful activities in the university campus. It could be taken for granted that the university would take restrictive measures against such activities so that order might be kept in the university, as a place for research and instruction. Such measures might in some cases be applied to the movement of teachers' unions when it had a radical political tendency and thus departed from the normal course of the union.

These measures to be taken on the part of the university authorities can hardly be said to be violating university autonomy. On the contrary, they can be said to be the measures to guard it. The reason is that what endangers university autonomy at the present juncture is in many cases neither the state nor the university authorities, but others, that is, a group of students and sometimes of the teaching staff who are closely tied up with the revolutionary forces outside the university.

Report of the Central Council on Education.

The new system of higher education has now been discussed in various sectors and in the light of Sir Hector's study. I should like now to refer to the report of the Central Council on Education on the

Improvement of Higher Education which has been submitted in reply to the question asked by the Minister of Education and also to the views and comments which have been made to criticize it.

The Central Council on Education is a body whose aim is to make a study and an examination of the policies of basic importance on education, science and culture in response to the questions asked by the Minister of Education. At the time of the report, it was composed of the presidents of leading state, public and private universities, the heads of the associations for the school masters of elementary, lower and upper secondary schools, persons of learning and experience representing the press and industry, and the representatives of the Ministry of Education. In addition, those who are well versed in the problems of higher education were called in to discuss and study as expert members of the council. The council further listened to the opinions of the representatives of the organizations interested in higher education and took into its consideration the experience in autonomy at Japanese universities both in pre- and post-war days and the conditions of university autonomy at foreign universities.

The report was completed in January 1963 after careful examination at more than seventy council meetings during about three years. I served the committee as chairman, and I am not the one to boast, but I can safely say that the report proposes from a fair point of view effective measures for university reform in Japan. It was based on the viewpoints of the whole nation, laying due respect to those of the university. It was inevitable that the report, although indicating a similar goal, proposed a different view on practical measures for individual cases.

Opposition to and Criticism of the Report.

As it was considered that this report was most likely to lead to the establishment of basic policy for the future improvement of higher education, the general public, especially universities and the organizations concerned with higher education, commented and criticized it and at the same time made public their views on university autonomy. Some of the universities even launched an opposing campaign against it. The most representative of the criticism and views were those made by the Association for State Universities and others that are worth noticing are those by the Association for Public Universities, the Association for University Accreditation, the Japan Science Council, and other organizations. The major views and opinions that were made clear or expressed implicitly therein are as follows:

1. Establishment of Laws and Regulations for University Administration.

The Report has not explicitly proposed the enactment of laws and regulations for university administration, but it was the intention of the Ministry of Education to establish a university administration law following the proposals contained in the Report. Although there are seventy-two state and thirty-four public universities, there exist no laws and regulations providing the basic principles of university administration and autonomy. In fact, soon after the establishment of the new universities after the war, an effort to enact such laws was made but it failed for various reasons. During the following thirteen years, the Ministry of Education seems to have felt again that it was necessary to enact laws and regulations outlining university administration and their autonomy. Despite the high privilege of autonomy granted to the university, it is not made clear at the university where the responsibility lies and how it is shared. As a result, there arose many chaotic situations. So, for the benefit of state and public universities, it was felt necessary to define legally where the responsibility lies for university autonomy. Meanwhile, the universities were of the opinion that standardization would violate university autonomy and strongly opposed the enactment of a university administration law. The Report recommended that the university in a democratic society not be closed to the society but be positive in its efforts to strenghen ties with the related community and be able to contribute to it, and, for this purpose, "to set up an organ with the people outside the university among its constituents when needed". To this recommendation, the state universities were opposed.

2. The Veto Right of the Minister of Education.

The same tough opposition was shown to the veto right of the Minister of Education, which, in a broader sense, is the Minister's supervising competency. The point of the problem is whether the Minister will have to accept all of the candidates nominated by the university for the future president or for professors at the university. The Central Council for Education understands that legally the Minister has the veto right, but the university strongly opposed this view. The Council considered that the Minister, who is the founder of the state university and the man with the highest responsibility for national education, had such a right, although "in exercizing the right, he will have to be very careful taking into consideration his responsibility for education and paying due respect first of all to university autonomy". The Council further proposed that in exercizing this right, the Minister needs to listen to the opinions of a committee composed of outsiders. Neither of these recommendations, however, was acceptable to the university.

3. Position and Competence of the President.

The Council hoped that the university would be consolidated upon an independent and organic basis with the president as its core. They attach greater importance to his position as the person with the highest all-around responsibility and leadership for university administration and autonomy in the democratic community. Again, the university viewpoint inclined toward curtailment of the competence of the president and the granting of greater competence to the University Council, and especially to the Faculty Council.

4. Position and Competence of the Faculty Council.

In the Report great importance is attached to the organic consolidation of the university as a whole and it is contemplated to grant autonomy to the Faculty Council as an integral part of the whole university set-up. In the meantime, there seems to be an intention on the part of the university group and of the Japan Science Council to attach too much importance to the autonomous position and the competence of the Faculty Council, thus considering the university not as a highly consolidated body but as a mechanical compound of various faculties with few organic ties. Especially the selection of professors, they urge, is the sole responsibility of the Faculty Council and neither the president nor the University Council is to take part in it. Also, this university group is reluctant to consider recruitment from outside of the faculty or to permit persons outside the faculty to participate in the selection.

5. Tenure of Professorships and Evaluation of Professors' work.

The Report recommends "the necessity of studying the regulations of the tenure of professorships and of the evaluation of professors' work", in view of the fact that the professorship is guaranteed until professors reach their age limit. Nothing has been counter-proposed by the university side, but probably I am right in supposing that the university is opposed to it.

6. Future of University Autonomy.

What will become of university autonomy confronted with such difficult problems? Will situations which may endanger university autonomy arise in the near future? It is supposed that the concept will change along with the further progress of political and social democratization. University autonomy, in its relation to state and society, will undergo a gradual change from a substantially closed, distrustful, and conflicting one, to a more open and co-operative attitude toward the state and society.

It is inevitable, however, that university autonomy would be endangered if Japan should fall into a totalitarian state of leftists or rightists. There is very little possibility of such a situation arising in the near future. My fear is, rather, that some disturbing force may emerge from within the university and the university itself be subjugated to it. If such a situation arose, autonomy would be submerged from within. In such a situation it could be justified that the person outside the university having the highest responsibility for national education, including university administration, would somehow intervene for the protection of autonomy. Such necessary measures should not be considered as obstructing, but rather as guarding university autonomy.

University Autonomy in Transition.

Will university autonomy not be endangered when it changes from the closed to the open one as political and social democratization advances? To answer this question, I would like to examine university autonomy first, in the process of its change and, second, after its completion.

From the point of view of the closed autonomy, the change from closed to open might appear to be a threat to university autonomy itself. Such could often arise especially in Japan of today where the concept of university autonomy is in the process of change from the old to the new as the result of the democratization of the university and the intensification of the character of the university as a social institution which is again the result of political and social democratization of the country.

University Administration.

Discussions were focused on the problems of university autonomy in its narrower sense, such as the exclusion of the forces outside the university and the appointment and dismissal of president and professors. The section in the report which deals with university administration was the target of vehement criticism. Antagonistic concepts of university autonomy aroused strong debates, particularly over enactment of the university administration law, and the competence of the Minister of Education over university administration, especially in his veto rights regarding selection and appointment of the president, and competence of the Faculty Council for the selection and appointment of professors.

It is requested that as the character of the university as a social institution is intensified university autonomy should broaden its scope and become more flexible in application. The Report of the Central Council on Education contains the following sections: the aims and character of institutions of higher education, the establishment and organization of the university, students' welfare and guidance, entrance examinations and university finance, besides the narrower concept of university administration. How to deal with all these matters constitutes problems of university autonomy in the broader sense.

Diversity in the Institutions for Higher Education.

As it is hard to describe this subject in detail, I should like to take for example the institutions for higher education in postwar Japan. There are six hundred and thirty institutions, including junior colleges, unified into one type of institution, that is, "the new university". The Report proposes the diversification of these institutions according to their aims and character and recommends that these institutions be classified into three levels corresponding to the academic standards of university, college and junior college and that academic status be granted to each of them accordingly. Such reform might be considered as a violence of university autonomy from the traditional viewpoint.

Planning for University Institutions.

It has been the custom to approve the establishment of a university when a given requirement is met, without paying due consideration to the educational planning. As a result, universities thronged about big cities and even though the establishment of schools of science and technology courses is greatly demanded, the number of such schools is too small to meet the demand. Recently, as the national planning for economic and social development is promoted, the over-all planning for education, especially for the establishment of universities, is urged. With due consideration of such national demand, the Report recommends, "the whole scale, that is, the number of schools and of students, the placement and the establishment of universities must be determined according to a plan based upon the desire of applicants, social needs and academic demands". Not only should the university be established in strict accordance to "establishment standards", but it must also make continuous efforts to maintain and to raise them. As there is much to improve on this point, the Report recommends that "the establishment standards must be applied strictly from now on and it is necessary to re-examine the matters requiring the approval of the Minister of Education at the time of establishment as well as on the occasion of major changes after the establishment. Measures must be taken to enable the Minister as the responsible authority to implement and also to maintain the establishment standards. When the function of the university as a social institution is strengthened with the advancement of democratization, the changes toward modernization and the new concept of university autonomy are inevitable. Again such development will probably be opposed by those who hold the conventional concept of university autonomy.

Students' Guidance and Self-Government Movement.

The new university has admitted and encouraged the students' self-government movement, considering it as a part of the students' welfare and guidance programme and also of their extra-curricular activities. The students' self-government movement, however, influenced by the unstable political situation in postwar Japan and as a result of the introduction of revolutional political movements has become a politico-social movement over-stepping the sphere of its normal activities, and in some instances has disturbed intra-mural order and caused social unrest in others. So, the Report recommends, "the university must assume the responsibility for controlling within its competence the students' political and other social movements through proper advice and guidance", making students aware of their duty to pursue their studies and inducing them to pay respect to the political neutrality of the university". This recommendation has been criticized as an infringement of university autonomy by a group unable to discriminate the university autonomy, the genuine students' self-government movement and the freedom of students as citizens from a distorted political self-government movement.

Entrance Examinations.

The relations between university autonomy and students is revealed in connection with the university admissions system. Those who are holding the concept of closed autonomy may insist that the university can select students in its own way acting on its autonomy without being annoyed by the educational and social effects of the admissions system. In Japan, each of more than six hundred institutions including junior colleges conducts the entrance examination on an individual basis. As a result, the so-called "ordeal of entrance examination" harasses mentally and materially the applicants and their families, and creates a serious social problem by putting the whole education of Japan into confusion and giving birth to a tremendous number of off-campus students, so-called "Ronin". To cope with such situations, the Report recommends the establishment of a body whose aim is "to study and decide the methods whereby to obtain highly reliable findings on the level of achievement in the learning and the scholastic aptitude of the applicants and to conduct in a proper way a common and objective test". It is contemplated that this non-governmental body will be a private foundation organized and operated by the people concerned primarily with the senior high school and the university, men of learning and experience, and officials of the Ministry of Education; its purpose will be to contribute to "a close tie and co-operation among the universities and between senior highschools and universities" and "to give better guidance to the applicants and alleviate their burdens". I expected that the university, being aware of its responsibility as a social institution, would co-operate readily in the improvement of the entrance examination, but there is still much to be done to meet the expectation. Here again, I fear that the concept of closed autonomy may be, even though unintentionally, the source of indecisive attitudes on the part of the university.

Anxieties Concerning University Autonomy.

In the scientific and technological civilization, where democratization and economic development advance, the character of the university as a social institution is intensified and university autonomy is changing from the closed one bases upon antagonism and resistance against state and society to the open one based upon understanding and co-operation. Such change in university autonomy may be taken by those who cherish the conventional concept for nothing else but the retreat and wane of university autonomy. On the contrary it must be considered as a new development of it.

Viewed from a different angle, however, such changes in the university and its autonomy must not be welcomed without reservation. For it is feared that such changes might violate university autonomy, not overtly, but from behind the scenes or through the provision of financial aid. I assume that the university is staffed adequately to assure excellent results in research and education. Maintaining this staff with physical facilities and adequate equipment so necessary to research, requires an over increasing amount of money, since the university is incapable of supplying for itself ever-increasing amounts of money, and must count mainly on state and society for financial resources. Here lies concealed a serious danger to academic freedom and to university autonomy.

University Finance.

The Report, approaching university autonomy in a practical and substantial way, treats "the autonomy of university finance" as an important factor of university autonomy, together with "the autonomy of personnel administration for senior staff members" and "the autonomy of the management of university facilities and students' affairs". From this viewpoint, the Report recommends that to enable the state university which is financed by the national treasury and therefore is under strict regulations to achieve its aims and missions, that a system be set up so that "an autonomous, flexible and practical use of appropriation" may be possible, more concretely, "budgeting to meet the demands of the long-term educational and research programme", "a flexible management in the implementation of budget" and "the acceptance and use of donations" should be promoted. The same demands are true for private universities, especially when they receive positive assistance from the national treasury.

The annual revenue of the university from their own funds is very little. So, the expenses which are not covered by the appropriation from the regular budget must be met by financial assistance in the form of donations directly from private sources or indirectly from a foundation. To pave the way for this, a hope has been expressed in the Report that tax exemption on donations be provided and a powerful foundation rendering financial assistance be established with co-operation among universities, private organizations and the state. It should be borne in mind, however, that, under the present economic conditions of Japan, it is difficult to expect from such foundations a large amount of money. Attention should also be paid lest the aid distort the original educational and research programme initiated by the university.

As we have seen, the expenses of either state, or public or private universities are covered by a regular budget appropriation. Political and social demands on the university will thus in practice be reflected upon this budgetary appropriation. In the present complicated society based upon science and technology and with the antagonism among races, social classes and political ideologies, it may sometimes occur that the political and social demands made upon universities through the budgetary appropriation and the university programme divorced from the party politics and devoted to education and research may be at cross-purposes. There lies the most crucial phase of university autonomy in the present situation. To prevent such a difficult situation, the adoption of an institution similar to the University Grants Committee of the United Kingdom may be proposed. Even in this case, the basic requirements for the smooth running of the system are believed to be the co-operation of universities and the state and society in attaining the desired objectives with good sense on both sides. I am convinced that such is the real nature of open autonomy in the present situation and that distrust, antagonism and struggle between the university and state and society undermines the ability to guard and promote autonomy at a democratized university in a democratic society.

ITALY

Dr. F. Vito

Rector, Catholic University of Milan

Open Questions concerning University Autonomy in Italy.

University Autonomy is not an end in itself. It is quite inconceivable nowadays that a University should enjoy complete independence from the State or should legitimately ignore the educational needs of society. Our problem consists in finding out the degree of autonomy which is a necessary condition of the adequate fulfilment of the function which is characteristic of an institution of higher learning. Obviously, this minimum degree of autonomy cannot be fixed in general terms as if it could be applied to and obtained in every country. It must be considered in the context of the educational system concerned. The greatest difficulties arise when the whole structure of the system is fundamentally incompatible with the amount of autonomy which is essential for the smooth working of the teaching and research activity of a university.

This seems to be the case with the Italian situation in so far as curricular matters and criteria for admission and selection of students are concerned. The determination of both is made by law; i.e. it is fixed once for all and applies to all Universities, whether they are big or small, are located in an industrial or a developing area, are well or poorly equipped with library, laboratory facilities, etc. There is of course some possibility of differentiating the curricula, as the individual institution can apply to the Ministry for some variations. But it is a very limited possibility; moreover it requires a time-consuming procedure and there is no certainty that the requests will be accepted.

This rigidity and uniformity of regulations may lead to immobility, i.e. to a situation in which the adaptation of teaching and research to the rapid evolution of knowledge becomes more and more difficult.

On the other hand, the rapidly changing social conditions and the parallel extension of democratization of education at the various levels demand a revision of admission and selection methods which cannot always wait until new laws are approved, without endangering academic standards.

The crucial point is the following: in a highly centralized and standardized system, in which the value of academic degrees is granted by the state, the remedy for the above-mentioned deficiencies cannot consist simply in allowing the Universities greater freedom in curricular matters, admission and selection and so on. The reform needed is a much more profound one. First of all, the university degree (there is only one in this country: the doctor's degree: and this indicates another aspect of the rigidity of the system) should be deprived of any practical value from the professional viewpoint; it should possess simply an academic value to the effect that competition among the Universities be stimulated. Freedom of choice as to curricular standards and admission requirements would then become compatible with the system. Accordingly the Public Administration should no longer rely almost exclusively on the universities for the preparation of those who intend to enter the civil service. It should either organize its own schools or arrange for specific methods of selecting people among candidates who may or may not have completed a definite university career.

Admittedly, all this would imply a fundamental change in the system, which cannot be brought about rapidly.

One cannot think of modifying from one day to another the entire structure of an educational system which is deeply embedded in the political and administrative organization of the country. This is clearly shown by the fact that even when it comes to university reform the political and administrative elements predominate as compared with the academic ones. It so happens that the new legislation which is being submitted by the Government to Parliament (not later than 31 March, 1964) has been prepared without the Universities as such being consulted. University professors have, of course, had a part in the preparation of the reform. This is based on the Report presented by a special committee composed of Members of Parliament and university professors appointed by the Ministry. In the second place the Ministry has asked the advice of the Higher Council for Education, a body comprising university professors elected by professors. But the universities as such have had no possibility of expressing their views.

This is not to be understood as a criticism. It is intended rather to convey the idea that a highly centralized and standardized system, which is publicly controlled even in matters like curricula, admissions, etc., is bound to obey political considerations rather than academic aspirations. This situation cannot be changed overnight. This is undoubtedly true. But in the long run, unless something in that direction, however gradually, is done, the academic standards of the universities will suffer, especially if the evolution of science and social changes continue at the same speed as at present.

Protection of University Autonomy in Italy.

It is generally admitted that over a very large area of the world the main question about autonomy is really a question about the relationship of universities and the State. This applies especially to countries where the university system is characterized by a strong centralization and where the typical university institution is the State University, as in Italy. In fact even the non-state University, i.e. the free university (università libera) as it is called in this country, known elsewhere under the name of private university, is all the same subjected to strict legal regulations concerning appointment of the teaching staff, admission of students, curricular matters, etc.

Nevertheless one is bound to recognize that, within the frame work of such a highly centralized and publicly controlled education system, the State does allow the universities a substantial degree of autonomy. It is true that in appointments to professorships at the various levels: full professors, professors in charge (professori incaricati) and assistants, some well established legal rules must be followed. But it is no less true that in the formation of the committees which nominate full professors as well as of those who nominate assistants or recognize qualifications for university teaching (liberi docenti) the universities do play a decisive rôle because the members of the committees are elected by the professors in the first case, or proposed to the Ministry by the Universities themselves in the second case or by the Higher Council for Education, which again is elected by the professors, in the third case. The Rector, i.e. the highest officer in Italian universities, is elected by the professors; and even when the appointment of the Rector (or of the Director for separate Faculties) lies in the hands of the administrative board, (as is the case in the free institutions) a consultative rôle is as a rule granted to academic bodies, such as the academic senate, consisting of the heads (presidi) of the various faculties.

Determination of the standards required for entrance to the university is fixed by law (there are only few exceptions for Faculties where an entrance examination is a condition for admission; but they will probably be abolished in the near future). A certain influence in the selection of students can be exerted by the University through the examinations which take place at the end of each academic year. But it is a rather limited one because, owing to the legal rules, a student can in practice remain a student for an indefinite number of years.

Again, the determination of curricula is a matter for legal decision. And this fact is quite understandable in a system where university degrees possess by force of law the same value no matter by which university they have been awarded. There is however in this respect a margin for decision by the universities in so far as they can apply to the Ministry for introducing into the study plan of the various faculties some specific subjects which are deemed useful for the preparation of students. As a rule their demands are satisfied.

No limitations are imposed on the Universities as to the choice of research programmes as well as the methods of allocating the available resources. Some institutions obtain financial assistance for research from industrial firms or public corporations; but so far there has been no indication of pressures being exerted on the part of the financing agency in order to reduce the freedom of the universities concerned. Of course the main source of financing researches and current administration of the (State) Universities comes from the State. Here again there has been no complaint that the State has unduly interfered in matters belonging to the realm of autonomous decisions of the Universities. Obviously the State does require to be assured that public funds are being prudently spent.

There is in the Italian university world a variety of opinions as to the merits of the present mechanism of distributing public subventions to the Universities, which is handled directly by the Ministry of Education. It is not quite clear to what extent the criticism and the objections to the existing system relate to the mechanism itself and from what point it unconsciously covers another issue, namely the insufficient amount of the subventions. In any case, this point is being widely debated at the present moment in this country (1).

---

(1) For further problems regarding the subject of this paper may I refer to my contribution to the volume: *The Status of University Teachers*. Reports from sixteen countries—prepared with the assistance of Unesco, 1961, I.A.U.P.L., Gand, (Belgium).

Translated from the Russian.

SOVIET UNION

Dr. G. D. Vovtchenko

Pro-Rector, University of Moscow

It is impossible to separate universities from the social development of their countries and their nations. The university community is above all a community of citizens having a fundamental responsibility for the well-being and progress of the nation. They should therefore work towards the best interests of their nation—which means in the best interests of humanity at large.

The problem of university autonomy cannot usefully be considered in the abstract—divorced from the political structure of the particular country concerned. If the government is democratically organized and pursues liberal policies, there is no conflict with the universities; the influence of the State on the universities in this situation can only be a forward-looking one.

Nothing is more easily justified, however, than the desire for autonomy among universities in countries where the advance of progressive ideas is not certain: given autonomy and freedom from supervision by the State, they could develop truly progressive knowledge in the interest of the whole nation.

In socialist countries the government is not in conflict with the people, but carries out their wishes; it is their servant. Therefore, in socialist countries, State direction of the universities does not restrict their autonomy nor hinder their free development.

State influence on the universities has the following aims:

a) the highest development of the universities themselves;

b) the training in the universities of the experts needed by the country;

c) the assurance for all graduates that they will find employment for which they are qualified;

d) the maximum standard of qualification for university teachers and research workers;

e) a high standard of further education based on modern academic ideas;

f) the establishment of priorities in universities for the most important research, from the point of view of the country.

In practice, these aims are achieved in the following ways:

a) distribution to the universities by the State of the funds required for their current costs and for their development;

b) overall planning for the training of experts and definition of the number of admissions to the universities, according to speciality and the needs of the country;

c) allocation to university graduates of work corresponding to their qualifications;

d) approval, at the request of the universities, of the titles of professor and "docent" and of the degree of doctor;

e) approval of the programmes of entrance examinations to the universities, and appointment of the state entrance boards which award qualifications corresponding to their knowledge to candidates on completion of their studies;

f) consideration of the most important research projects of the universities and the co-ordination of their most outstanding work in the national system of economic development.

The intervention of the State in the work of the universities is a helpful one, designed to ensure their progress, the improvement of their standards of teaching and research, and the broadening of their influence in the life of the country. From another point of view, State intervention in no way restricts the freedom of the university in matters of its internal organization.

University autonomy finds practical expression in the following ways (in relation to the five points made by Sir Hector Hetherington):

Point 1.

a) The Rector himself decides, in the light of present needs, the number of professors and teachers required for each Chair.

b) The appointment of professors and teachers is carried out through a competitive examination, details of which are made available through the press to all the scholars in the country. Under this system, the candidate is chosen by secret ballot during a meeting of the University Council.

c) Holders of academic appointments must be re-elected every five years. The same people are eligible for re-election for a further period of five years, but they can also be demoted if the University Council feels that their work has not been satisfactory.

d) The Deans of the faculties are elected by the Faculty Councils for a period of three years, by secret ballot.

e) The academic degrees of Candidate and Doctor are awarded on a thesis defended before the Faculty Council (in the case of the degree of Doctor, the decision of the Council is submitted for confirmation to an Accreditation Committee, made up of the most highly respected scholars of our country).

f) The Faculty Council also puts before the Accreditation Committee suggestions for the award of the titles of professor and "docent", after holding a meeting to examine carefully the results of the academic and teaching work of the candidates.

Point 2.

a) The object of Soviet university education is to train, in the context of the economic, cultural and scientific needs of the country, specialists who are not only masters of the most advanced techniques in their field, but who are at the same time of wide culture and discrimination.

This training is carried out in the light of the special national characteristics and the cultural and economic requirements of each of the Republics in the Union.

b) The academic staff themselves draw up the programmes determining the amount of knowledge required for each discipline. These programmes are examined and confirmed by a meeting of the professors or, for the largest disciplines, in common with all the specializations of the faculty, by the Faculty Council.

c) The academic staff themselves (taking into consideration the development of knowledge and the requirements of life) carry out any modifications they feel to be necessary in the teaching programmes; they establish the list and the order of priorities in the disciplines as well as the number of hours devoted to each one. Teaching programmes are examined by the Faculty Councils and confirmed by the University Council.

The Ministry chooses the teaching plans and programmes which are the most effective from an academic point of view, and suggests them as models in order to guide the universities.

Point 3.

a) The conditions of admission to the universities are identical throughout the country, and are drawn up according to the educational programmes taught in the secondary schools of the Soviet Union. But the level of knowledge provided by the universities is related to each one's standard of teaching; it depends also on their potential in laboratories and equipment, and on their resources in academic institutes, eminent scholars, etc. For these reasons, the level of knowledge in the different universities may vary in matters of detail, but more especially in the programme of specializations offered—the number and type of which are not the same everywhere.

b) The requirements for university degrees are always dependent on the development of the discipline concerned and on the wish of the authors of theses to produce a theoretical generalization or a solution to important academic problems; there is also an individual element, and the requirements depend in the last analysis on the ability and the academic qualifications of the teachers themselves, who award the degrees by secret ballot within the Faculty Council following the public defence of a thesis. This is why, in point of fact, the requirements for theses vary according to the university. These are most strict where there are the most developed academic institutes in the field under study.

Point 4.

The scholars themselves, working through the various Chairs of the university, choose the themes to which they will devote their research. Their suggestions are submitted to the Faculty Council, which draws up a research plan for the Faculty as a whole. This plan provides for the development of the traditional academic institutes which have grown within the university; the development of new academic disciplines; the encouragement of certain specific research concerned with the national economy which is frequently financed by the authorities concerned. These plans, of course, are drawn up according to the potential of the Chairs and the strength of academic staff required. The plans drawn up by the faculties are considered and approved by the University Council.

Point 5.

a) Every year the university submits requests for grants to the Ministry, drawn up according to the total needs of the Chairs and the faculties and the development of new academic disciplines, the establishment of new laboratories, the acquisition of new scientific or teaching equipment, etc.

b) The allocation of the funds granted by the Ministry between the faculties, the Chairs and the other academic institutes, is carried out by the Rector of the University according to actual possibilities, the necessity of ensuring the encouragement of new branches of learning and finally the needs of the Chairs and other institutes.

This brief report will have demonstrated that the universities of the socialist countries (and the University of Moscow is an example) have available every means of development, and enjoy complete autonomy in decisions concerning the life of the university. At the same time they collaborate closely with the needs of the national economy and in the interest of the whole people.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Dr. Herman B Wells

Chancellor, Indiana University

The structure of higher education in the United States is varied and complex. We have some fourteen hundred degree granting colleges and universities. They are sponsored by religious groups, secular boards, states, municipalities, and in a few instances by the federal government. Many of these institutions provide only collegiate education leading to the baccalaureate degree. Others provide courses leading to a wide variety of degrees, undergraduate and graduate, and provide research opportunities for extensive post-doctoral study. Some have small enrollments, other are large.

There is no central or national coordination of these institutions. Hence the system or lack of it provides great flexibility with consequent opportunity for experimentation. But the variety present in the system makes generalization extremely difficult. To comment on all of the differences or nuances would require a paper too long to be effective.

I shall confine, therefore, my generalization to those institutions which are recognized to be true universities in the world meaning of that term.

In these institutions, whether publicly or privately controlled, best practice is essentially very close to that outlined by Sir Hector. Although there are superficial differences, these are more apparent than real. Perhaps I can best illustrate by commenting on the organization and operation of Indiana University and my experience with it.

Indiana University is a state-sponsored institution offering undergraduate and graduate degrees in many fields. It has an eight member lay Board of Trustees in which is vested the legal responsibility and title to most of the property of the institution. The Board is the legal representative of the state government and of the public. Though faithful to its public responsibilities, the Board is also an arm of the University itself. It operates as a buffer between state government and intemperate public opinion when voiced against the University. It helps to interpret the University to the public and to interpret the University's financial needs to the state government. Five members of the Board of Trustees are appointed by the State Board of Education and three are elected by secret mail ballot of the holders of university degrees.

The Board elects or appoints the President of the University and the other members of the faculty and staff. In practice this function is performed only upon recommendation of the appropriate faculty and staff bodies.

The appropriation for annual support is made available by the state in a lump sum to be used as determined solely by the University acting on recommendations by various academic and staff groups.

The University has four legislative bodies which recommend and/or determine policies for its operation: (1) the Board of Lay Trustees, (2) the faculty which delegates much of its responsibility to an elected senate, (3) a staff council chosen by all of the non-academic staff of the University, and (4) a student council elected by the students. In addition, there are thirty or forty University-wide standing committees which set policies, e.g., Library, Admissions, Scholarships, International Activities, Curriculum, etc. Many of these have student as well as faculty members. The members of the faculty are by state law given full authority over the curricula, the fixing of standards for student performance and graduation and similar academic matters.

Tenure members of the faculty can be dismissed only for academic incompetence, the determination of which is to be made by carefully prescribed procedures governed solely by tenure members of the University faculty. As evidence of the significance of the vitality of this tenure policy, the late Professor Kinsey served for many years on our faculty vigorously expounding views on sexual behaviour in conflict with the generally accepted mores of our society.

Speakers on controversial subjects are welcomed to the campus.

The above practices are common in the better universities in America, although they may differ slightly in detail.

There are differences, of course, between types of institutions. In fact, the relationship of an institution to church bodies, if church-related, its age, its background, and the state of its development profoundly influence its policies.

I was pleased that Sir Hector dismissed some of the cliches and myths concerning the governance of universities in the United States. Many of these myths grew out of conditions 75 years ago which were described by Veblen, Carlson, and others and which have long since disappeared in our well-established institutions.

As I have pointed out, our lay boards perform a useful function. They represent the public interest in higher education. They help to protect the university against intemperate demands on the part of political bodies or large donors. They help to interpret to society the financial and spiritual needs of the university.

It must be remembered that our universities, both public and private, are not administered by governmental ministries. They have within themselves, under their own control, their bureaus of administration performing fiscal record keeping and other functions that in many other countries of the world are lodged in governmental ministries.

President James in his letter of September 23 requested comment on "the specific conditions that now exist in the United States that in your opinion restrict the autonomy of universities or the problems that may arise to jeopardize it in the foreseeable future".

The trend in the United States is toward greater rather than less autonomy. There may be some danger in the current effort of American higher education to increase to a dramatic degree its share of the "gross national product". This effort has already, of course, brought us much higher academic salaries and vast support for research. If the universities push too hard, however, other competitors for the G.N.P., including the private consumer, are nearly certain to resist the effort in various ways such as the launching of inquiries as to necessity for such rapid increases, questioning academic efficiency, urging increased public control of expenditures, etc.

There are those within our universities who express alarm over the massive research grants of the federal government to universities. They allege that these grants are distorting university development and in time will create an imbalance between the sciences and the humanities. In response to this concern, the Carnegie Corporation has recently published the results of an exhaustive survey of the effect of these grants on University development. The Carnegie inquiry found that the entry of the federal government into the field of support has been beneficial to scholarship and to university development. A related study has just been concluded by a national commission which has examined the need of additional support for research in the humanities and has recommended to the Congress of the United States the creation of a National Humanities Foundation to make grants in support of humanities studies as a companion to the already established National Science Foundation which makes grants of federal funds for support of research in the scientific disciplines.

Pluralism of support in our system is an important safeguard of autonomy. Few institutions in America depend on a single source of support; hence, no source of support is in position to dominate policy. To illustrate, about one third of the funds for my institution come from state appropriations (for annual operating costs and for new construction). The remaining two thirds come by funds from the federal government for support or research, teaching programs in languages, student loans and scholarships, etc.; from private donors for student aid and many special projects; a modest portion from fees paid by students, earnings of university auxiliary enterprises, grants from the great foundations, and from our own endowments. This is the pattern of all state universities. This pluralism of support gives the university a flexible and reassuring financial base.

Non-state universities receive more of their support from student fees and endowment income. The large private universities, however, also receive large grants for research and certain types of teaching programs from the Federal Government and in some instances from State Governments.

I shall mention one detail which may be of interest. The Congress of the United States is not as sophisticated in its understanding of the role of public support for higher education as is the typical state legislature. This is due, in my judgment, to the fact that the Congress has only recently entered the field. This sophistication will come in time with more experience.

Although I feel we are moving in the right direction with regard to autonomy in the United States, I am equally convinced that vigilance is ever the price of freedom. It is, therefore, necessary to be on the alert, to perfect those procedures which contribute to autonomy, and to experiment to find new and better techniques. The great foundations frequently finance inquiries designed to achieve such objectives. There are national organizations devoted to this cause. One of these is the powerful American Association of University Professors which is ever alert to condemn violations affecting faculty tenure. Public leadership, generally, including our most responsible press, stands on the side of freedom and autonomy for our university community and speaks out in any time of danger. Hence, our universities do not stand alone in their determination to protect their freedom and autonomy.

LEBANON

Dr. C. K. Zurayk

Professor of History, American University of Beirut
Former Rector, University of Domascus

I. A Descriptive Statement

In Lebanon, there is a variety of universities and other institutions of higher education with different administrative organizations stemming from their particular origins and sources of authority. But from the point of view of this discussion, they fall into two categories: 1) the Lebanese University, a Government institution which was established in 1953 and forms part of the public system of education of Lebanon; and 2) the private, local or foreign, institutions, some of which were founded many years before Lebanon's independence and all of which are now operating by virtue of Lebanon's policy of educational freedom. These are, in the order of the dates of their foundation: The American University of Beirut (1866), the Université Saint-Joseph (1875), the Beirut College for Women (1924), the Académie Libanaise des Beaux Arts (1937), the Ecole Supérieure des Lettres de Beyrouth (1944), the Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Mathématiques et Physiques (1945), the Institut de Géographie du Proche et Moyen Orient (1946), and the Beirut Arab University (1960).

A. The organization of the Lebanese University is modelled, to a large extent, on the French system. The University enjoys internal autonomy, but, being established and supported by the Lebanese Government and forming part of the public system of education, this autonomy is subject to checks from governmental authorities as stipulated in the decree setting up its organization. Article 2 of this decree states: "It (the University) enjoys administrative and financial autonomy, and is subject to the trusteeship of the Minister of National Education, in accordance with the stipulation of this decree". This autonomy and the checks to it may be illustrated by the following provisions, dealing with the appointment of staff and the selection of students:

All academic and administrative staff (other than lecturers on short time appointment) are members of the University *cadre* and form part of the Lebanese civil service. They are subject to the administrative, financial and other regulations governing the civil service; for instance, they cannot belong to political parties or engage in political activity. But the University shares in the appointment of its senior administrative staff and its permanent faculty. The Rector is appointed by the Council of Ministers, on the proposal of the Minister of National Education, but this proposal must be based on a recommended list of three candidates of the rank of professor presented by the University Council. A similar provision governs the appointment of the Deans of Faculties and the Directors of Institutes. All members of the academic University *cadre* (professors, assistant professors and assistants) are appointed by decrees, on the proposal of the Minister of Education. But here again this proposal must be based on a list of two candidates for each vacant post, presented by the University Council on the recommendation of the Council of the respective Faculty. The University Council may also present an alternative list.

The establishment of Faculties and Institutes for the teaching of professions or disciplines is subject to action by the Council of Ministers, on the proposal of the Minister of Education, which is either based on the recommendation of the University Council or has been forwarded to the Council for its view. The minimum standard for admission to any of the Faculties or Institutes is stated in the Decree of Organization of the University and has since been embodied in the Law on the Organization of Higher Education (26 December, 1961); it is the Lebanese Baccalaureat (Part II) or its recognized equivalent except for the study of Law where no equivalent is accepted. Questions of equivalence are decided by a special committee in the Ministry of Education including in its membership representatives of university institutions in Lebanon.

The University has so far set no limitations on student enrolment, except in its Higher Teacher's Training Institute, which primarily prepares teachers for the public secondary schools administered by the Ministry of Education, and the bulk of whose students receive a stipend during this preparation. But with the anticipated large increase in the number of candidates, it is probable that the University, like similar institutions in the area, will have to resort to some limitations, at least in the Faculty of Sciences and kindred Faculties.

Space does not allow the examination of provisions dealing with other facets of the University-Government relationship in the operation of the University, such as the determination of curricula, the choice of research programmes, and the allocation of resources. In all of these and similar facets, the picture is the same, namely an internal autonomy, subject to Government controls, more or less on the European, and particularly the French, pattern.

B. The situation of the other universities is governed by two sets of factors: a) those relating to the origin and structure of the particular university; and b) those arising from its operation in Lebanon.

The American University of Beirut is like any private U.S. institution of higher education. The highest authority resides in its Board of Trustees, but this authority is exercized largely in the appointment of the President of the University, the Deans, and the senior financial officers, in the approval of recommendations for faculty tenure appointments, and in the allocation of funds and the approval of the budget. Academically, the University has to meet the minimum requirements of the Board of Regents of the State University of New York by which it is chartered. Within these general limitations, the University enjoys internal academic, administrative and financial freedom. The Beirut College for Women, also an American private institution, is, with respect to our discussion, in a similar situation.

The Université Saint-Joseph is also a private institution, whose Rector is appointed by the Jesuit authorities in Rome. However, it is subject to controls by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, either directly or through intermediate organs. These controls are due, on the one hand, to the assistance in staff and funds, which it receives from that Ministry and, on the other, to the fact that it follows the French programmes and prepares for French degrees. Professors from the French universities, notably Paris and Lyons, participate in the examinations.

The Beirut Arab University was founded by a local philanthropic society, but has received assistance from the Egyptian Government in the form of funds and of seconded teaching and administrative staff, who at present occupy the senior positions at the University. It follows the Egyptian programmes and its degrees are sanctioned by the University of Alexandria, representatives of which participate in the examinations.

The Académie Libanaise des Beaux Arts is a private Lebanese institution benefitting from a subvention from the Lebanese Government, but internally free in the execution of its programmes. The Ecole Supérieure des Lettres, the Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Mathématiques et Physiques and the Institut de Géographie du Proche et Moyen Orient are affiliated to the University of Lyons and subject to its regulations.

Traditionally, the Government of Lebanon has followed a remarkably tolerant and encouraging policy towards these institutions and both it and Lebanese public opinion have recognized the services which these institutions have rendered to Lebanon and the neighbouring countries. The Government has not interfered in the operation of these universities. They have been free in the organization and execution of their programmes. Recently a law was passed by Parliament (December 26, 1961), for the organization of higher education in Lebanon. It lays down the conditions for the establishment of any new university, faculty or institute, and the minimum academic requirements for faculty appointments and student admission. It also provides for the institution in the Ministry of Education of a "Council on Higher Education" with relatively broad functions. These provisions have not, however, hampered the work of the private institutions.

These institutions are also subject to certain indirect controls. For instance, non-Lebanese staff must, like all non-Lebanese who have an occupation in Lebanon, secure a work permit, but the Ministry of Social Affairs has so far been co-operative and has not placed any serious restrictions on the granting of these permits to the academic and senior staff of universities. Another form of control is that relating to the recognition of degrees and diplomas, whether for civil service employment or for the practice of professions. This recognition is granted by the Ministry of National Education on the recommendation of the Committee of Equivalence, on which the university institutions are represented. But there are certain basic stipulations in the Government laws and regulations. Any university degree or diploma must be based on a programme of study whose minimum entrance requirement is the Lebanese Baccalaureat (Part II) or its officially recognized equivalent. Among other conditions, the years of study leading to the degree are taken into consideration for purposes of recognition and, in certain cases such as Medicine, are actually stated in the law regulating the practice of the profession.

Yet, in spite of statutory regulations and indirect controls, it can fairly be stated that the private universities, which are mainly of foreign origin and support, enjoy a remarkable degree of freedom in Lebanon. This freedom is characteristic of the general policy of the Government of Lebanon and of the open attitude of its people, and is considered as one of the fundamental bases of the country's national outlook and way of life. For their part, the private universities have been appreciative of this bread outlook, and have made their distinct and valuable contribution to the educational life of Lebanon and of the Middle East in general.

II. A Forecast of the Future

It is very difficult to predict the future of university autonomy in Lebanon, or for that matter in any country of the world, because of the rapid political, economic, social and educational changes which mark our age and which have their impact on the relationship between universities and their societies. Thus the following remarks do not claim to be more than a tentative forecast of trends which appear from the present vision of the writer as likely to characterize university autonomy in Lebanon in the coming years.

Here again it is essential to distinguish between the national Lebanese University and the private universities and institutions in Lebanon, most of which are largely foreign in administration, programmes and sources of support.

A. As far as the national Lebanese University is concerned, one can envisage trends towards the broadening of the scope of its autonomy as well as others which will tend, on the contrary, to restrict it.

1. It seems likely that, on the administrative side, the Lebanese University will gradually gain greater autonomy. Some of the regulations and the bureaucratic procedures which at present hamper the free-

dom of the University, by virtue of the fact that it is a Government institution, will eventually be liberalized. The Administration, Faculty and students of the University are demanding this lightening of the burden of administrative and financial control. This was one of the demands of the students in the strike to which they resorted for a few days in December 1963 to bring the needs of the University forcibly to the attention of the Government and of public opinion. A large and influential section of public opinion supported the students' demands, though not necessarily their means of pursuing them. From this point-of-view the future of the autonomy of the University seems promising.

Another element, arising from the special constitution of Lebanon, should be mentioned in this context. Because of the intricate confessional composition of the Lebanese people and the traditional policy and concern of the Government to seek a balanced representation of the confessions in the Government civil service, this factor tends to play its part in the appointment of the administrative and teaching staff of the University and in the distribution of the various available positions. It has had its bearing on the freedom of the University in the recruitment and appointment of staff. However, with the growth in the number of qualified candidates from the various confessions, it will be possible to obtain the desired balance without affecting this freedom.

2. The serious difficulties in the way of the autonomy of the University will tend to arise, in the view of the writer, from the economic, social and educational development of the country. Among the most conspicuous of these is the growth in the number of students. The rapid development of secondary education and the over-whelming predominance of the general academic type of programme and school over vocational and technical training are annually increasing the number of candidates seeking admission to the University. The University has not yet introduced any measures of selection (except in the Higher Teachers' Training Institute), and the student body has already grown beyond the scope of its facilities. Whether the University will be able, in the face of this rising demand, to adopt selective measures to safeguard standards of teaching and to allow for necessary research is a problem which it shares with most institutions of higher education in the world to-day, particularly the new institutions in the rapidly developing countries. It is a problem which has its definite effect on the capacity of the universities of to-day and to-morrow to maintain their autonomy.

However, it should be said that the Lebanese University is still a young institution established in 1953, and its main need at present is the development of its academic, technical and physical facilities. To undertake this development most effectively and rapidly, it should enjoy a larger measure of autonomy. But as in all other state institutions, it seems that this autonomy can only be won gradually and as a result of constant effort and struggle. Whether the crying demands of the time can be satisfied with slow, gradual progress along this line is one of the most vexing problems confronting universities to-day.

B. The private institutions, which form the majority of the institutions of higher education in Lebanon and two of which—the American University of Beirut and the Université Saint-Joseph—are well established and have a long tradition of service behind them, are not likely to face any serious direct threat to their freedom. The Lebanese Government and society are dedicated to a liberal policy in educational and other matters and see in this policy an essential element of their national life and a guarantee of their stability and progress.

However, the present indirect controls are, in the nature of things, bound to become tighter. The trends operating in this direction may not become fully effective in the very near future, but they have to be reckoned with in any long-range view of the changing situation. Laws and regulations on the employment of non-Lebanese will tend to become stricter or more strictly enforced, particularly with the greater availability of Lebanese candidates to fill university positions, and the private foreign institutions will find it harder to appoint non-Lebanese staff. The preference accorded to national university degrees and diplomas will probably be extended rather than diminished, and the private universities may find themselves forced to adapt their programmes and curricula to the requirements of the national degrees. Possibly, under the pressure of public opinion, the Government may impose limits on the fees charged by the private institutions. In these and other ways, the trends of national life are likely to lead to more, or to tighter, indirect limits to the operation of the private, and particularly the foreign, institutions. They may also result in a stricter application of the provisions of the present statutory regulations.

Furthermore, the growth of the Lebanese University and of the other national universities in the region is bound to restrict the scope of the services of these institutions. For one thing, their high tuition fees, as contrasted with the nominal fees or the free education and the various forms of student assistance (cheap lodging and boarding facilities, stipends, prizes, etc.) of the national universities will tend to divert students to these institutions. Side by side with this, the foreign institutions will find it increasingly harder to raise in their countries of origin the funds necessary to support their programmes or to develop them in accordance with their own plans. Thus their freedom of operation will be limited not only by outside government controls but also by developments in the society in which they operate and by factors arising out of their own origin and constitution.

This leads to the conclusion that the question of the autonomy of the university, particularly in our day, does not merely involve the relation of the university with the government or other sources of authority in its society, but embraces, in the broader sense, its capacity to formulate and to execute its plans amidst the various economic, social and educational developments of its society. In our age of rapid change, of social revolution and of mass education, and in the face of the soaring costs and financial requirements of programmes of higher education, universities are encountering new obstacles to their freedom of operation which are more subtle, but no less effective, than those which traditionally limited their autonomy.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE

by

Sir Hector Hetherington

1. I have read with deep appreciation the comments on my paper made by members of the Administrative Board. These comments disclose some errors or deficiencies in my presentation, arising partly from the imperfection of my knowledge of other University systems than the British, and partly from ambiguities of expression. I realize also that certain sections of my paper are perhaps unduly didactic in tone, as *e.g.* par. 11 where I outline at some length procedures for appointing to several offices and posts in the University, which my own experience has led me to regard as likely to be satisfactory. I hope, however, that this paragraph and others will be read not as dogma but as illustration. Procedures must be related to circumstances and decisions can be reached, quite consistently with University autonomy, by other means than mine.

2. In substance, however, I think there is no difference of principle between the views of members of the Board and my own. Their comments seem rather to add to what I have written a certain philosophical depth and historical authority. They show indeed how very varied are the political and economic situations within which Universities must try to interpret and to fulfil their commission, and how variously these conditions affect their organization, relationships and immediate possibilities. Yet it appears that the ultimate intention of the University is everywhere the same. Perhaps, therefore, save for the removal of a few ambiguities, I may leave my paper as it was written. But I should be glad to be allowed to add two brief supplementary notes.

a) My paper touches only incidentally on one issue which is mentioned in several of the comments—the part to be taken in the foundation of University policy by those 'tenure' or 'established' members of the academic staff, who have no 'ex officio' place on any governing body—in general the younger staff. This is an important and not entirely easy matter. This large group is responsible for a great and steadily increasing fraction of the total activity of the University which cannot prosper without their strong initiatives and devotion. That devotion cannot be elicited and sustained by any exercize of authority but only by a widespread sense of commitment and participation. There is therefore every reason why they should feel themselves to be full members of the academic community.

On the other hand, large assemblies are not well suited to the work of close deliberation and decision. Two measures therefore seem to be appropriate. This constituency should have the right to be represented on the governing bodies by electing from their own number a proportion of the membership of these bodies. And at stated intervals and quite formally, occasion should be taken to communicate to the whole group information about those major matters of academic, financial or building policy which are engaging the attention of the governing bodies,—not for its decision, but for such suggestion, comment or criticism as it is disposed to offer. Apart altogether from the encouragement of morale, these measures, if my own experience is any guide, will produce some interesting and useful ideas.

b) Because of its bearing on one section of my paper (Section 16c.), where I describe the central element in the British management of State-University relationships, (the University Grants Committee), I ought to report that within the last few months a great change has come over the British University scene. Whether wisely or not, the British Government has formally adopted the view that the best means of meeting the welcome and rapidly growing demand for higher education is to channel a very large fraction of that demand into the Universities. To that end four major steps are being taken. (1) The existing Universities (including those recent foundations which are hardly yet fully organized) have been asked and mostly have agreed to expand the number of their students far beyond the limits mentioned in my par. 12(e). (ii) A further group of new Universities is to be created, (iii) Some twelve Colleges of Higher Technology are to become Universities, and (iv) Colleges of Education in England (*i.e.* Colleges for the training of teachers) are to be brought fully within the academic and administrative responsibility of the Universities.

These measures will throw a very severe strain on University staffs and administrations, and must in the end compel considerable changes in their organization and in their methods of mutual consultations of action. They involve also an enormous increase in the budgetary requirements of the Universities, partly by the inevitable enlargement of the capital and recurrent costs of the existing Universities, and partly because the Universities will now be responsible for the expenditures of many institutions which have not hitherto been part of their system. Almost all this increase must be borne by the State funds: and it is certain that in view of the expenditures involved, as well as of the larger part which the Universities will now assume in National Education, both Government and Parliament will feel a much more intimate concern with University affairs. Some important changes in governmental administration have already been effected: and there are even a few signs of the relevance of Dr. Wells' cautionary words in par. 13 of his comment.

Even so, it is material to note that the University Grants Committee, enlarged but composed as before, and with substantially the same functions, is retained as the central intermediary element in the Government-University relationship: and great importance is attached, on both sides, to its retention.

That is reassuring for, to date, British experience of this device has been very satisfactory. Indeed from the point of view of preserving the autonomy of a University which is in great measure dependent on State support, I find it difficult to think of any equally effective mechanism. But there is no doubt at all that the new situation will impose great strains and pressures on the Committee, and in some degree modify its accessibility to the Universities and the present open possibilities of easy informal communication and discussion.

INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITIES BUREAU

(Secretariat of the International Association of Universities)
6, RUE FRANKLIN, PARIS XVI

PERIODICAL

* *Bulletin of the International Association of Universities*

Since 1953. Four numbers a year: February, May, August, and November. Each number contains an account of the Association's activities and a survey, in English or in French, of university matters of international interest.

REFERENCE WORKS

International Handbook of Universities

Third edition, 1965.

World List of Universities, Other Institutions of Higher Education, University Organizations. 1965.

Seventh edition, 1965.

* *Collection of Agreements concerning the Equivalence of University Qualifications*

1954. 246 pages.

1955. First Supplement, 35 loose leaves.

1956. Second Supplement, 100 loose leaves.

1958. Third Supplement, 120 loose leaves.

1961. Fourth Supplement, 65 loose leaves.

Documents concerning the Equivalence of University Qualifications

1957. 280 loose leaves.

PAPERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

1. *Three Aspects of University Development To-Day*
   1953. 46 pages.
2. *Health at the University*
   1954. 76 pages.
3. *Student Mental Health*
   1958. 76 pages.
4. * *University Education and Public Service*
   1959. 151 pages.
5. * *The Interplay of Scientific and Cultural Values in Higher Education Today*
   1960. 81 pages.
6. * *The Expansion of Higher Education*
   1960. 117 pages.
7. *University Autonomy — Its Meaning Today*
   1965. 137 pages.

STUDIES AND REPORTS

The Staffing of Higher Education

1960. 169 pages.

Formal Programmes of International Co-operation between University Institutions

1960. 39 pages in-4° (published by Unesco).

Some Economic Aspects of Educational Development in Europe

1961. 144 pages.

* *Report of the International Conference of Universities, Nice, December, 1950*

1951. 162 pages.

Report of Proceedings, Second General Conference of International Association of Universities, Istanbul, September, 1955

1956. 232 pages.

Report of Procedings, Third General Conference of International Association of Universities, Mexico, September, 1960

1961. 224 pages.

Report of a Meeting of Heads of African Institutions of Higher Education, Khartoum, 16-19 September, 1963

1964. 107 pages.

Administrative Reports of International Association of Universities; 1951-1954

1955. 40 pages.

Idem: 1955-1959

1960. 58 pages.

Idem: 1960-1964

1965. 124 pages.

JOINT UNESCO-IAU RESEARCH PROGRAMME IN HIGHER EDUCATION (1)

The International Study of University Admissions:

Vol. I: *Access to Higher Education*, by Frank Bowles.
1963.

Vol. II: *National Studies*. 1965.